

# The Profile of Paul

**Truth is unveiled**

## 12 APOSTLES - SELECTED

Jesus had many followers. But he selected twelve of them as his main disciples, whom he appointed to be his apostles. They were very loyal to him and followed leaving every thing so much so they were conferred by Jesus the favour of being the main persons for this high office of apostleship.

*Now the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip and Bertholomew; Thomas and Matthew the Publican; James the son of Alphaeus and Lebbaeus, whose surname was Taddaeus; Simon the Canaanite and Judas Iscariot...* -Matthew 10:2-4

These names we can see in Mark 3:16-19, Luke 6:14-16 also. But in the gospel of Luke we find Juda as brother of James instead of Lebbaeus whose surname was taddaeus as made mention in Matthew and Mark.

These twelve apostles were given the power of healing the diseased and of casting off the devils.

*And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease.*

-Matthew 10:1

And these twelve apostles were given a special power of forgiveness. They can forgive the sins of whomever they wish and retain the sins of those whom they do not like to forgive.

*Whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.* -John 20:23

They were commissioned for the high office of preaching in the status of apostles.

*Then said Jesus to them again, peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* -John 20: 21

Not only this but they were made so fortunate as that would occupy the twelve judgment seats on the day of judgment and judge the twelve tribes of Israelites.

*And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* -Matthew 19:28

## PETER - CHIEF OF CHURCH

Keeping in view of all these points, it is evident that the apostleship was limited to the twelve disciples of Jesus. But there is no restriction for preachers. They may be as many as necessary. From among these twelve apostles, Simon peter was blessed with the highest status on whom the church was to be built.

*And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* -Matthew 16:18

And again Jesus the messiah promised Peter that he would give him the keys of kingdom of heaven.

*And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*  
-Matthew 16:19

And what a curious fact is that Jesus prayed for Peter that he might be firm in faith and in discharging his divine duty with which he had been commissioned with.

*And the lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.* -Luke 22:31-32

Eventually, when Jesus was about to depart from the world, he handed over the responsibility of leading the church as according it was built on him.

*So when they had dined, Jesus saith unto Simon Peter, Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, yea, Lord: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, FEED MY LAMBS. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, yea Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, FEED MY SHEEP<sup>1</sup>. He saith unto him the third time simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, FEED MY SHEEP*  
-John 21:15 –17

### DECAY OF CHURCH - JESUS' PROPHECY : MISINTERPRETED

From the above passage it can be well ascertained that, leading of the church after Jesus, was commissioned to Peter as its chief apostle. And at the same time Jesus prophesied that how a heart breaking event would take place.

---

1. The phrase "My lambs" or 'My sheep' means all that believe on Jesus with no discrimination either as a Jew or a Heathen.

*Verily, verily I say unto thee, When thou was young, thou girdest thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.* -John 21:18

The above prophecy of Jesus clearly speaks that after Jesus, the chief apostle Peter would lead his church in strict accordance with the laws and rites as had been expounded by Jesus, until he would attain his old age. But in the last period of his old age, when someone would establish a new church with all against to the doctrines of his church, he would become quite helpless, and would not be able to resist the rival. This is exactly what the prophecy means to say. Thus the true church of Jesus which had been built on the rock - Peter was supplanted by the new church established by the self styled apostles.

In spite of the clear exposition of the prophecy which one can arrive at, the existing church being the followers of the new church, has edited the prophecy to mean as follows in its successive verse which reads as

*"This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God..."*  
(John 21: 19).

One can understand how irrelevant is the interpretation as made out in the verse 19, above. The prophecy of Jesus clearly places two points regarding the attitude of Peter one relating to his youth and the other of old age. If these attitudes were to mean for his death, as modified by church, Peter should have died twice, once in his youth and the other in his old age, so as to attribute this prophecy for his death. But in reality it can be interpreted to mean as that he walked wilfully in his youth, but in his old age he was led to the place where he wanted not to go. In clear terms Peter's mission would survive in his youth on the foundation laid by Jesus on him, but when he attained his old age, his mission would be supplanted by some other doctrines which he would not like. Thus he was led to the place where his will would not feel pleasure.

Secondly, even if we take it for granted that the prophecy as recorded in John 21:18 was spoken signifying that what manner of death he should glorify God (John 21:19), in the whole of the Bible no vestige information regarding to his fateful death or event which led to his end is recorded. Until his last days he was very busy in his high office as the

chief apostle of Jesus' Church, preaching and teaching the Gospel . If this be the fact how can the (present) church justify that the prophecy had been made signifying his death as edited in John 21:19, as if he had been crucified or slain or stoned to death or some undesirable event had been given effect to his fateful end? Exactly as has been prophesied by Jesus, Peter could lead the church in correct manner as had been ordained by Jesus. But (perhaps) when he was about to reach to the last twenties of his life term he found a new church, a new gospel, with all new doctrines contrary to that of his own Church.

## RIVAL CHURCH

How was the rival church established? What were the doctrines? Who were its founder members? And who was its chief founder? What became of Peter's Church? How was it superseded or supplanted? - All these points can be made known if we study carefully right from the book of Acts and all epistles to the end.

Paul declared that he was made apostle for Gentiles by Jesus and God. It has been so introduced about him as that the man who was oppressing the (real) church of Jesus till then, after seeing Jesus in vision became an apostle of Jesus. And popularizing suchlike many more devices, Paul occupied the highest place in the church which was established by him and provided good opportunities for his founder members. However, Paul using possible dialectics against the church of Peter, announced that he himself was the real apostle and all the rest as false apostles<sup>1</sup>. This point can be made known from our further arguments.

The former name of Paul, was Saul. In the beginning he was introduced by name Saul but latter became Paul. During the life time and his ministry, Jesus never knew this Saul nor can one see him as the persecutor of Jesus and his disciples and followers at anywhere in the Gospels. But he appears in the Book of the Acts, as an oppressor of the church<sup>2</sup>, who later became an apostle of christ.

## Thus we read from the following\_\_

*A) And cast him [Stephen] out of the city and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul. -Acts 7:58*

---

1. II Corinthians 11:5 + 12:11 + 11:13 + 11:18 + 23      2. Acts 9:1

*B) As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison. -Acts 8:3*

*C) And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem. And as he journeyed he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink. And there was a certain disciple at Damascus; named Ananias; and to him said the Lord in a vision, Ananias, And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for behold, he prayeth. And hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight. Then Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and Kings and the children of Israel: For I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house: and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou comest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. -Acts 9:1-18*

## PAUL PROCLAIMS - JESUS APPEARED IN VISION: AND MADE HIM APOSTLE

By whom the book of the Acts has been written is not known. The unknown author of this book introduces Paul as one who had created a havoc of the church, and came to Damascus to take hold on the followers of Jesus who scattered abroad. On his way to Damascus, that Jesus appeared to him in vision and made him an apostle. These points can be seen from the foregoing passages A.B.C as narrated by the author of the Book of the Acts--

And the same event has been quoted to have been stated by Paul himself in his defence on trial before the chief captain under -Ref. Acts 22:1-21

We can also see the same event as quoted to have been stated by Paul in defence on trial before the judgment seat of King Agrippa under -Ref. Acts 26:9-20

## DISCREPANCY IN NARRATIONS

Thus we have the repetition of same event under three references as follows

- A. Acts 9:1-18
- B. Acts 22:1-21
- C. Acts 26:9-20

If one makes a comparative study of the above three passages under references, one can find the following discrepancies.

From the first passage under reference Acts 9:1-18 the verse number 15 explains that Paul (Saul) was made apostle for both Gentiles and Israel. (And)

Verse number 7 discloses that those that had journeyed with him had heard the voice but had not seen anybody.

While according to the second passage under reference Acts 22:1-21, the verse number 21 speaks that he was made apostle for Gentiles only.

And verse number 9 expresses that they who accompanied Paul on his journey to Damascus saw the light but did not hear the voice of him that spoke with Paul.

According to the first two passages, it is said that Paul was to be informed by one Ananias at Damascus, as to what he had to do.

But the passage under Ref. Acts 26:9-20 says that he was informed instantly at the place where he saw the vision.

To speak in clear terms the statement as narrated by the author of the Book of the Acts has been contradicted by Paul himself in three points. Thus with grave contradictions Paul has been introduced. As we told earlier, the author of this book is not known yet church claims that it has been written by Luke. Whoever may be the author but one thing is certain that it is none from the apostles of Jesus. And if it were really by Luke, it may be noted that Luke was very dear disciple of Paul (II Timothy 4:11).

So far as to the point concerning the above contradictions it is reasonable to give more concern to the one's own personal claims than the others' statements relating to that person. And hence we are tend to give sanction to Paul's claims. Therefore the claim of Paul saying that he had been made apostle for Gentiles can be treated as more authentic. Then one may wonder as to how that statement has been made by the author of Acts, that Paul was made an apostle by Jesus both for Gentiles and Israel.

## TWO GOSPELS - TWO CHIEFS

As has been discussed, not only in the passage under reference 22:1-21 but also in the following we can find Paul to have stated that he was made an apostle for Gentiles; and Peter for Jews.

Thus we read in Galatians 2:7-9

*But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; ( for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty*

*in me toward the Gentiles;) And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship: that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision -Galatians 2:7-9*

From the above it can be well ascertained that there were two Gospels - one for circumcised ones (Jews) and the other for uncircumcised ones (Heathens or Gentiles), and two chief apostles - one for Jews (Peter) and the other for Heathens or Gentiles (Paul).

One must bear in mind that when Jesus was laying the responsibility on Peter of leading the church, he (Jesus) did not say that Peter was for Jews (Circumcised ones) and that he would appoint some other suitable candidate such as Paul for Gentiles (uncircumcised ones)

Jesus said to Peter... (1)... He saith unto him, feed my lambs. (2) ... He saith unto him, feed my sheep. (3) ... Jesus saith unto him, feed my sheep (John 21:15-17). In the passage Jesus says, 'My lambs and my sheep' - these phrases mean, all people that believe on him, with no discrimination such as Jew or Gentile.

Further take note of the following passage.

*And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. -Mark 16 : 15*

*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations baptizing...  
-Matthew 28:19*

From the study of the above passages we can find Jesus to have authorized all his apostles to go all over the world and preach the Gospel to all mankind with no discrimination either as a Jew or Gentile. Contrary to this, Paul says that he was appointed for Gentiles and Peter for Jews. If Jesus had really intended to conduct two groups of preachers-one for Gentiles and the other for Jews under two leaders could ever Jesus have laid down the responsibility of preaching to every creature of the world on the shoulders of his apostles? If the claim of Paul were true would Jesus have not appeared at least in the vision of Peter and made it clear that

Paul had been appointed by him for Gentiles and suggested Peter to continue his preaching only among the Jews, providing chance to Paul to preach among the Gentiles? But the things appear to be contrary<sup>1</sup>. There were two gospels and two churches<sup>2</sup> and two chiefs: each for one. A careful examination of the epistles written by Paul makes it clear that there was a dissent group with divergent doctrines which strove hard to establish its prominence over the other.

## **DISPUTE NOT BETWEEN JEWS AND DISCIPLES BUT BETWEEN PAUL'S AND PETER'S CHURCHES**

*A) For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ  
-II Corinthians 2:17*

The above passage is taken from the letter of Paul written to Corinthians. From the above it can be implied that the disciples belonging to the group of Peter might have disturbed the faith implanted by Paul and his disciples. And so to keep them firm on the faith as preached by him, Paul criticizes that they themselves were not as many which corrupt the word of God. This implies to mean as saying that what Paul had Preached was free from corruption, while those others had corrupted the word of God. One may mistake that other party for Jews. But "Speak we in Christ" prove that the other party was Peter's party. If it were really Jews, "speaking in the name of Christ" becomes meaningless. Because Jews do not care Jesus. Though this point is ambiguous in this verse, the following passages agree with our point of argument. Thus Paul branded the church of Peter as ungodly.

*B) Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is christ's, even so are we Christ's.  
-II Corinthians 10:7*

This verse discloses that Peter's party might have branded the party of Paul as antichrist. So in counter to their remark, Paul says if they (Peter's) were of christ's, they themselves (Paul's) were more of Christ's.

1. Apostles did not believe that Paul was a disciple... (Acts 9:26)

2. Church means group of people but not the building as a place of worship.

The verse above B is a strong witness to prove that the rivalry was not between Christians and Jews, but among Christians<sup>1</sup> themselves under two groups.

C) *For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves; but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise* -II Corinthians 10:12

In this also we find one deriding the other. Paul writes that the other group of apostles were not wise.

And again Paul says :-

D) *For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles* -II Corinthians 11: 5

In this Paul says that he is not less than any chiefest apostle. This discloses the fact that the dispute was not between Jews and disciples but between Peter's church and Paul's.

E) *I am become a fool in glorifying: Ye have compelled me; for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing.* -II Corinthians 12:11

This verse clearly states that Paul disputes with the apostles. And says that he is no less than any other apostle.

f) *for such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.* -II Corinthians 11:13

In this verse Paul describes the apostles as false apostles, deceitful workers. And again he says that they have disguised as apostles of Christ, "transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." This is a good example that how Paul used his dialectics on the apostles of Christ to impress upon the then Christians<sup>1</sup>. And further to impress the present

---

1. Here the word 'Christians' means - the people who profess faith in Jesus as Christ. But not as followers of the religion known as Christianity.

Christians<sup>1</sup> that it was a dispute between him and the false apostles only but not between Peter's church and his. But the following verses prove that to whom he described above as false apostles were no other than the real apostles of Jesus.

G) *for ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face, I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak. Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold, (I speak foolishly) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they the Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent in deaths oft.* -II Corinthians 11:20-23

From all above passages it can be noticed that there were two churches, two gospels with two leaders each for one and their disciples; one contradicting the other; one calling the other as false apostles and as deceitful workers. And each one was trying to get an upper hand over the other. What were those two churches? One that was founded by Jesus on Peter and other apostles with Peter as its chief while Jesus was yet living<sup>2</sup>. The other church, according to Paul's claim, was founded by Jesus, on Paul, for Gentiles, in his vision after the departure of Jesus.

.... the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee. -Acts 26:17

If what Paul claimed were true could ever Jesus have asked his disciples to preach the whole world? In this way had Jesus not included the Gentiles also? Then what necessary was there to appoint an additional apostle specially for Gentiles? When such points as these are raised, the present church being the followers of Paul - to shroud over blunders, they simply say that he wrote about the false prophets only but not about Peter and other disciples and gospel. They further add that Peter and Paul and their disciples were co-workers who unitedly worked in the ministry of Jesus' gospel. And at the same time they accept that there were indeed two leaders one Peter for Jews and the other - Paul for Gentiles. What a humorous thing is that this point was again contradicted by Paul himself in his deposition on trial before Chief Captain, saying as that he was an apostle appointed by Jesus to all men.

---

1. The followers of the religion known as Christianity founded by Paul (Acts 11:26)

2. Mark 16:15 + John 21:15-17 + Matthew 28:19-20

Thus we read -

*“And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there, came unto me, and stood and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. **For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.**” -Acts 22:12-15*

And another thing what we would like to bring to the notice of the readers is, those to whom Paul accused (branded) as false apostles, were no other than the Jesus' real apostles - Please read the following passage which discloses this fact.

*“I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak. Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold, (I speak foolishly) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more...” -II Corinthians 11:21-23*

From the above passage one can notice that the dispute and controversy was not between Jews and Paul as he proclaims<sup>1</sup> but between the churches of Peter and Paul.

If there had been dispute and rivalry between Paul and Jews it would have been a matter of no concern at all. But it was between Paul and the church of Peter. (Or) If it were on their personal grudges, even then there would have been no matter. But what heart breaking point is that the rivalry between Paul and Peter was due to religious and doctrinal differences of opinion. This points out very clearly that what Paul was preaching was not in conformity with the preaching of Peter and vice versa. Here let us bear in mind that Peter being the chief apostle of Jesus, he would have been preaching the same fundamentals as had been enjoined upon to do. If that be the case, if the teachings of Paul were not in conformity means, he (Paul) was preaching some new doctrines.

1. or the present church might have modified, noticing the event of his having been attacked by church of Peter and was about to be killed (Acts 26:21), to hide these facts from the present Christians' notice, so that they might not slip which all points can be detected from our further arguments made in coming pages.

## **The prevalent church has been founded by paul:**

**Paul says:-**

*a) I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase  
-I. Corinthians 3:6*

*b) According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. -I. Corinthians 3:10-11*

What important thing to note is that Jesus says that he had built his Church on Peter (Matthew 16:18).

In this way Jesus had laid foundation on Peter. Then therefore everyone has to build according to the foundation laid on Peter by Jesus. Quite contrary to this Paul says- that he had laid foundation on Christ himself. And warns that no other foundation be laid than what he had laid. Thus foundation was laid on Jesus by Paul. It means to say indirectly that one should follow Paul himself. This injunction rules out the prominence of Peter's Church. Does this point not prove that there was no relevance between the teachings of Paul and Peter?

Let us examine some opinions of Christian Scholars regarding this point.

A) The Christ of Pauline Epistles has no relation at all to the historic Jesus. We need scarcely hesitate in regarding St. Paul, indeed, as the real founder of our religion.

(Mackintosh-The person of Jesus. P.51)

**Mackintosh** very clearly expresses his opinion that the Christ of Pauline Epistles has no relation at all to the historic Jesus. This remark very convincingly admits that what Paul has preached about Jesus has really no relation with Jesus or with his teachings or with what he expected of his followers.

And further he expresses his view so deliberately that Paul was the real founder of the Christianity. This point very clearly admits that the Church has been built on the shoulders of Paul but not on Peter's as had been decreed by Jesus.

**B) B. W. Bacon** writes in his renowned book, "Making of New Testament" in page. No. 61 in conformity with the above view of Mackintosh in clearer terms as here under.

*Without the pauline Gospel about Jesus, Christianity could never have become more than a sect of reformed Judaism.*

This opinion of B.W. Bacon not only strengthens the above view of Mackintosh in toto but also provides an inference that Jesus had never preached a religion of his own as Christianity, but he had only reformed the already existing Judaism.

But contrary to this St. Paul had professed a new religion under the banner of christianity with all his self invented dogmas and doctrines. Thus the present Christianity is the brainchild of Paul (Acts 11:26). And hence it appears that the Christians are not real Christians<sup>1</sup> but Paulines<sup>2</sup> under the presumption as Christians<sup>1</sup>.

NB:- They may be called as Christians as they are following the Christianity founded by paul, if they prefer to be called as. But they cannot be real Christians in the sense of the followers of Jesus. They may be devotees of Jesus, but not followers.

The early Christians (the followers of Jesus) followed in Peter's leadership till he attained his old age. The hold of Peter on the Church established by Jesus on him (Peter) was gradually being slipped and ultimately remained in the form of Unitarians and Sossanians as two minor sects which in the long run disappeared. Thus the Church of Peter was vanished away ultimately.

### **Was Peter really incompetent to lead the church?**

Were he really incompetent to lead the church, could Jesus ever have selected and appointed him as his chief apostle, handing him over the keys of the kingdom of heaven? No. Not at all.

(Or)

- 
1. Christians in the sense of the followers of Jesus
  2. Followers of Paul

Did Jesus appoint Peter for this high office tentatively on temporary basis, to be dismissed after, when the eminent and suitable person like Paul was made available?

(Or)

Does Church regard Jesus as a person with flexible and unstable mind who appointed Peter in haste with vain and vague promises such as made which we have mentioned in our beginning pages, and later snatched away his leadership and gave it to Paul?

On examination of the "Book of Acts of Apostles" and the 'Epistles', it can be made evident that the Church has been founded on Paul and thus he became the chief apostle and founder of the Christianity. Who this paul was? Where has peter gone leaving the responsibility of feeding the sheep of Jesus in the hands of Paul? And how the leadership and the teachings of Peter have been supplanted by paul?

The prophecy of Jesus about Peter came true: "*Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedest whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old, then thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not.*" - John 21:18

### **What a mystery?**

Is the church which was built on Peter for circumcised ones (Jews), and the one that was built on Paul for uncircumcised ones (Gentiles)?<sup>1</sup> There may be two or even more leaders with their respective jurisdictions for the reason of lessening the pressure of work. But there should be no more gospels than one which was given through Peter and his elected apostles by Jesus.

*And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.* - Mark 16:15-16

From this passage one can understand that just before his departure, Jesus entrusted the responsibility of preaching to his twelve selected apostles. They were not ordinary followers or disciples but were

---

1. Galatians 2:7-9.

given the status of apostles. And more over their jurisdiction was not limited to the Jews only but for the entire mankind. There was only one gospel given by Jesus through his apostles. It may be noted that only one gospel was preached by Jesus which was narrated by somany people (authors) while only four Gospels are incorporated in the Bible as authentic. Yet they are not free from contradictions and interpolations. Whosoever believes the real gospel given by Jesus through his apostles would attain Salvation and he that does not believe would be damned. There may be as many preachers as are necessary for conveying of the message<sup>1</sup>. But there can be no more apostle than the twelve as had been appointed by Jesus. And this is the reason why one cannot find any other name along with the names of the twelve apostles on the foundations of the heavenly city Jerusalem, (Revelation 21:9-16).

At the time of entrusting the responsibility of preaching the Gospel to his twelve apostles, Jesus stressingly says - *"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved..."*. This discloses the fact that the gospel necessary for one's own salvation has been given already, which rules out the further demand and necessity of another Gospel, such as one for circumcised ones (Jews) and the other for uncircumcised ones (Gentiles) as made mention by Paul.

## DOCTRINES AS PROPOUNDED BY PAUL

Now let us have a glance on the doctrines propounded by Paul, so as to find out the reasons for contradistinction between the two churches.

### 1. Jesus - apostle and high priest: 1st Doctrine of Paul

*wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house. -Hebrews 3:1-3*

1. After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come. Therefore said he unto them the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. -Luke 10:1-2

In the above passage we find Jesus to have been given the status of an apostle and high priest. And further it is stated of him as one appointed by God to whom he was very faithful. In the third verse discrimination between Moses and Jesus is pointed out saying as that Jesus was counted worthy of more glory than Moses.

Apostleship and priest- hood are such favours as are conferred upon only human beings, and hence are not blasphemous or sacrilegious against God Almighty. More over Jesus claimed himself to be a prophet which point all his disciples agreed, as such there could have been no controversy nor dispute in this regard.

As regards to the distinction as pointed out between Jesus and Moses is also not so serious an affair as to make a deep probe into. Comparison between two prophets or men is a very common thing. As to this, read what Jesus says.

A) *The men of Nineveh shall rise in Judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas: and behold, a greater than Jonas is here.*

*-Matthew 12:41*

B) *The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon: and behold, a greater than Solomon is here. -Matthew 12:42*

Hence the affirmation by Paul that Jesus was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, is not an offensive statement. So this point might not have been the reason for the dispute and controversy between the two Churches. And at the same time it became advantageous for Paul to attract the people and to get some prominence among the preachers.

### 2) Paul preached that Jesus is "THAT CHRIST":

#### II Doctrine according to Paul.

*And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ. -Acts 18:5*

An examination of the gospel records as stated by the various writers reveals the fact that there is no firm opinion about Jesus' being a Christ. Christian theologians interpret "Christ" as one chosen of God. Thus this word applies to every prophet of God in general. Because every prophet was a chosen one of God. We also admit that Jesus was Christ. But Jesus, we find in gospels, to have denied to be called as Christ. Let us examine.

A. *Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the christ.* -Matthew 16:20

B. *And Jesus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Caesarea Philippi: and by the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, whom do men say that I am? And they answered, John the baptist: but some say, Elias: and others, One of the prophets. And he saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the christ. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.*  
-Mark 8:27-30

C. -----(same as above)-----(and then) the final answer of the disciple was-The christ of God.

*And he straitly charged them and commanded them to tell no man that thing;* -Luke 9:18-21

From the above three references, we find Jesus to have strictly exhorted his disciples not to reveal before people that he was Christ. And in another place we find Jesus to have accepted before a Samaritan woman that he himself was Christ.

*The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he* -John 4:25-26

And another thing is, despite his clear order not to preach about him as Christ, not only did his disciples preach about him as Christ (Acts 5:42), but also all gospels made mention of him as Christ. So the question why Jesus ordered them not to call him Christ remains unanswerable.

According to above statements we find ambiguity concerning the point of 'christ'. No doubt Jesus was a Christ. In reply to the question to the disciples what were they thinking of him, Peter said (according to the existing gospel records) - "*Thou art the Christ*". Then Jesus commended him, saying that this information was revealed by God Almighty only. And at the same time commanded not to say this before people. All gospels proclaim that Jesus was Christ; Disciples preached Jesus as Christ. Had he really warned them not to say before people that he was Christ, could ever his disciples and the gospel writers have dared to proclaim that he was Christ?

According to Jesus that Peter was informed by the God Almighty that he (Jesus) was Christ. Despite this, Jesus' warning to his disciples not to say about him as 'the Christ' became a mystery. Can Church unravel this ?

Basing on my prediction, the disciples might have said that Jesus was "That Christ." For this only he might have raised his objection. Christ is different form "That Christ" just as 'prophet' from "that prophet".

In the passage(Mark 8:27-30) we find Peter saying "*Thou art the Christ*". Jesus charged them not to call him like that. But in the passage (John 4:25-26), the Samaritan woman says, "*I know that Messiah cometh which is called Christ*". Here he accepted that it was he himself. In the above two statements we find a crucial difference as regards to Christ. In the former one it is said- "The Christ" - it is denied by Jesus. In the latter one it is said - "Christ" - it is accepted by Jesus. Peter said "The Christ" in the sense of "That Christ". Though the word "The" stand for "THAT" in literal sense, generally it goes unnoticed taking the meaning of "The" only as an article before every noun. And this is the reason why generally people are not able to make any distinction in this type of verses, particularly regarding "the Christ" and "the Prophet" when are used to mean "That Christ" and "That Prophet" respectively.

John was a prophet- but not that prophet

In this connection I would like to recall the incident as recorded in John 1:19-25.

*And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art Thou?*

*And he confessed and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ; And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No.*

*Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?*

*He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.*

*And they which were sent were of the Pharisees.*

*And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not **that Christ**<sup>1</sup>, nor Elias, neither **that prophet**?*

*-John 1:19-25*

From the above passage, take note of the clauses- “why baptizest thou then if thou be not’ **That Christ**’ nor Elias, neither ‘**That prophet**?’”

### “That Christ” - “That prophet.”

In the above passage, John said, that he was not “**That Christ**” and said also that he was not “**That prophet**”.

Here we must bear in mind that John was a ‘prophet’ (Luke 1:76). Yet he accepted not to be called as ‘**THAT PROPHET**’- This discloses the fact that there is a great difference between a ‘prophet’ and ‘**That prophet**’ This is the same point that created ambiguity in the case of Jesus also. No doubt that he was Christ -but not “**THAT CHRIST**”. Thus Jesus had commanded his disciples not to preach about him as “**That Christ**” but might have, being Christ, asked them to preach about him only as a Christ. This was why they preached him as Christ and gospel writers made mention of him as Christ in their gospels.

*And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ. -Acts 5:42*

But Paul preached Jesus as “**THAT CHRIST**” which point was rejected by the apostles. Not knowing the minute difference between ‘Christ’ and “**That Christ**” people began to regard Paul as a great preacher of Jesus.

---

1. In the Open Bible, The new king James version ‘That’ is replaced by ‘The’. In Telugu version instead of **That Christ**, only ‘Christ’ is mentioned.

Therefore this second doctrine of Paul was also regarded as in favour of the doctrine as propounded by Peter’s Church.

Thus this type of preaching about Jesus by Paul was the reason that how he got a special place in the then Peter’s churches of other places<sup>1</sup>. These are two examples that how Paul had used his devices to get prominence among the real followers of Jesus.

### **3. Jesus is redeemer-Through his blood salvation is appointed. III Doctrine According to Paul**

*A. For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.*

*-I Thessalonians 5:9-10*

*B. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: -Colossians 1:14*

*C. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace:*

*-Ephesians 1:7*

*D. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.*

*-Galatians 1:4*

*E. And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. -Colossians 1:20*

Thus after getting some recognition in Peter’s churches in Damascus and in other places, probably he might have preached his invented doctrines.

From the foregoing references from epistles we find Paul to have preached the salvation and forgiveness of our sins through the blood of Jesus on cross. And his contention is for this purpose he (Jesus) offered himself as a sacrifice and died on cross for us. Thus this new doctrine of Paul might have caused disturbance in the real teachings of Jesus as were being preached by Peter’s Church. Basing on such other doctrines as these, controversy began to take root in between the two Churches and two chiefs, and rivalry predominated.

---

1. Except Jerusalem because he did not come to Jerusalem in his early period.

The first thing that perplexed the minds of Peter's people is, whether there could be any other person that could redeem mankind from the hands of God. For this we find God Himself saying that there is none competent enough to redeem.

**Please observe the following few verses from the law and prophets.**

A. *See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill and I make alive ; I wound and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. -Deuteronomy 32:39*

B. *Yet I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but me: for there is no saviour beside me. -Hosea 13:4*

C. *Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul: and forget not all his benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; Who redeemeth thy life from destruction: Who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies. -Psalms 103:1-4*

D. *Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things: That stretcheth forth the heavens alone: that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself: -Isaiah 44:24*

E. *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: For I am God and there is none else. -Isaiah 45:22*

From the above passages we understand that God Himself alone is our Saviour, redeemer, and forgiver of the sins provided "We look at Him" meaning - if we repent and amend ourselves and follow the statutes.

The same view we can see in the following verses in clearer terms.

*But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live? -Ezekiel 18:21-23*

Above passage provides a very simple way of getting oneself released (protected from entering into) of Hell and attaining of eligibility to enter into the paradise. That is by abstaining from committing sin, and following the statutes and by means of repentance. This much is enough for salvation.

But contrary to this Paul introduced and preached a peculiar doctrine of salvation by the blood (sacrifice) offering of Jesus on cross and his death as ransom and vicarious atonement. Of course ransom and atonement are recommended in old Testament, but they are for other purposes but not for this type of salvation of mankind.

### **Whom should one follow... Whether Jesus or Paul?**

Prophets were sent in every age for the reformation of the mankind. They taught the path that leads to attain salvation. They became models by following an ideal life as had been enjoined by God Almighty. They insisted people to follow them so as to get eternal life. For instance, we can see in the Gospel of Matthew 21:32 a number of people who got eligibility to get into the Kingdom of God by believing and following the prophet John who was the contemporary of Jesus (Matthew 21:32).

Contrary to these facts let us see what were the proclamations of Paul.

a. *Brethren, be followers together of me... -Philippians 3:17*

b. *Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ -I Corinthians 11:1*

Now the question is whether he made these proclamations being he himself was an exact follower of Jesus. To be frank, one who proclaims as above should be one that imitate Jesus both in deed and thought without least divergence. Then only one can be regarded as the follower. But contrary to this- one's belief and acts become void and termed as mere pretence (II John 9).

Jesus preached only as according to the injunctions as made mention in the scriptures. For example let us see about an oath,

*Thou shalt fear the lord thy God: him shalt thou serve and to him shalt thou cleave and swear by his name. -Deuteronomy 10:20*

And like wise Jesus too warned that they should not forswear in any other name except that of God Almighty. So much so he reiterated that their word should be accepted even without an oath. And likewise James also writes in his epistle (James 5:12). It does not mean that taking oath is totally prohibited. In clear terms what Jesus opined in his exhortation, (Matthew 5:33-37) is, that one should not take oath in others name except that of God. The following two passages focus on these facts.

*And it shall come to pass if they will diligently learn the ways of my people to swear by my name, The Lord liveth: as they taught my people to swear by Baal: then shall they be built in the midst of my people. -Jermiah 12:16*

*I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow every tongue shall swear. -Isaiah 45:23*

But contrary to his proclamation that he was following Jesus- Paul preached and practised all against to the teachings of Jesus.

For example as regards to the commandment of taking an oath- examine the following.

*I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his Kingdom. -II Timothy 4:1*

And again Jesus exhorts...

*Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven -Matthew 5:19*

If this be the repercussion if the least commandment of God is violated and teach men to do so how do Paul give an account for all his teachings against to the law?

*But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but the man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us: for it is written cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*

*-Galatians 3: 11-13*

Therefore he suggests a shortcut route to attain salvation...

*That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. -Romans 10:9*

Paul exhorts that one should accept Jesus as one's own Lord who died and was raised from the dead. Thus Paul preached the easiest way of attaining salvation.

But Jesus exhorts that one should...

*a. He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life... -John 5:24*

*b. He that followeth me shall have the light of life. -John 8:12*

Now the question is whether the Gospel of salvation as propounded by Jesus was perceived more perfectly by Paul than Jesus himself or failed to understand it in its real perspective. The doctrines what have been propounded by Paul against to the real teachings of Jesus can be seen in pages to come. If this be the case can the proclamation of Paul that he was following Jesus be taken for granted?

Now we have to see if Jesus had said any thing about his sacrifice and resurrection. On examination of the gospel records we find Jesus to have said in one place as follows:

*...and to give his life a ransom for many. -Matthew 20:28*

Matthew states in his gospel, that Jesus to have said this. Ransom for many -many means not all: but more than some. Ransom for many represent only to christians. Then it means not all christians but many.

Therefore 'many' from christians represent to mean (maximum) more than half: or at least half of the christendom or little less.

It is recorded in the gospel of John that John the baptist to have said showing Jesus - "*Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the World*" (John 1:29)

According to John, Jesus redeems the whole world. If the whole world is taken to mean as the entire mankind of the time of Jesus, including contemporaries and that who come onwards it excludes the people that appeared before Christ . How unjust God is for having not sent Jesus right in the beginning of the world depriving the majority of people of not getting ransom by Jesus!

According to the quotations which we have mentioned in the beginning of this topic, paul says---

1. We have redemption through his blood.
2. He gave himself for our sins. Etc...

From these two sentences the pronouns 'we' 'our' stand for Christians. Christians means all Christians with no exemption. Thus Jesus ransomed his life for christendom.

Thus variance is seen in the number of people that are ransomed by Jesus . Let us not worry about the number, but let us see whether the doctrine of redemption and ransom is correct.

Let us see what Jesus had exhorted his followers to do to get entry into the kingdom of God.

Let us take it for granted for a while that Jesus had offered his life on cross as a ransom and redeemed the christendom, as proclaimed by paul. If it were true why Jesus further suggests the Christians<sup>1</sup> that they should get eligibility to enter into the kingdom of God by saying as here under :

---

1. The word 'Christians' here to mean in the sense of 'followers of Jesus' but not in the sense of people belonging to religion christianity as such.

*A. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. -Matthew 5:20*

If this be the case, what became of the blood that was shed as ransom?

*B. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses. -Matthew 6:14-15*

In this we find that we must pardon the sins and excesses made by others, toward us. Then only we will also have face to ask forgiveness of our trespasses made against God. Here also the blood, of Jesus that was shed on cross became void.

*C. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. -Matthew 12:36*

In this passage Jesus explains the people that they will have to give account on the day of judgment for every idle word that they speak. If this be the case with idle word, what will be the repercussion of greater sins? Does this not prove that no ransom or vicarious atonement be accepted?

*D. But when Jesus heard that, he said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. -Matthew 9:12-13*

In this passage Jesus explains the cause for his manifestation. He came to call the sinners to repentance. This speaks clearly that one needs repentance for the forgiveness of one's own sins but not his (Jesus') vicarious atonement or death on cross.

We have a number of such verses as above in gospels which all go to prove that the doctrine of Ransom, Redemption, and death of Jesus on cross for our sins as advocated by Paul, was not really preached by Jesus and his apostles but a later invention . Thus Peter's church finding this to be quite contradictory, tried their best to prevent Paul from propagating such doctrines, but in vain. This was the reason for hostility between the two churches.

#### 4) Doctrine of Ransom -Redemption by offering Jesus himself on cross, died for our sins. This is the fourth Doctrine of Paul.

- A. And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour. -Ephesians 5:2
- B. And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. -II Corinthians 5:15
- C. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour: that he by the grace of God Should taste death for every man. -Hebrews 2:9
- D. Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. -I Timothy 2:6

#### JESUS WAS PUT ON CROSS: WAS IT HIS WILFUL SACRIFICE?

Jesus was sent to Israelites for their reformation. Reformatory work generally falls against to the prevalent practices that are invented by wrong notions.

Thus we read from the following passage (Matthew 15:1-13)

*Then came to Jesus Scribes and pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, why do ye also transgress the Commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me: And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in*

*vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand. Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the pharisees were offended after they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. -Matthew 15:1-13*

From the above passage we notice that Jesus gave the correct interpretation of the law regarding the washing of hands. And in various places, it can be seen that how Jesus gave correct interpretations regarding the observance of sabbath day and suchlike various other doctrines. He also quoted the prophet Isaias' prophecy- that how the people wastefully worship God with their traditions leaving his commandments.

For these reasons, the Israelites thought him to be an imposter only, but not really a man of God. However, they found the mission of Jesus flourishing day by day and great multitude of people following him. Thus they began to predict that their Judaism would soon vanish away. So to protect their religion from decay, they made a strategy to make an end of Jesus himself. But they could not dare attack him openly for fear of multitude of people that were following him. Jews succeeded in provoking rage of the rulers against Jesus accusing him as a traitor. Knowing all this he went underground and remained in disguise. So the Jews and the rulers failed to track him down.

#### Satan enters into the field.

*And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.*

*Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot being of the number of the twelve.*

*And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them.*

*And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money.*

*And he promised, and sought opportunity to betray him unto them in the absence of the multitude -Luke 22:2-6*

Satan is an open enemy of man. He tries always to mislead by making him disobey God and thus deprives him of the God's bliss. In whatever act, deed, or occasion his (satan's) involvement is found, one must understand, that it is purely designed for man's destruction only. He is not our benefactor. He helped Jews in betraying Jesus by instigating evil desire in one of his disciples<sup>1</sup>, which act ultimately resulted in getting the sentence of crucifixion passed against Jesus. Did Satan really help the Jews? No, but he made them all enter into ever lasting hell for having betrayed the innocent Jesus with false accusations such as a traitor etc;

There was really no enmity between Jews and Jesus on their personal grudges. But Jews did not like the reformations which were being made by Jesus. As a matter of fact, it was not Jesus that they wanted to get rid of, but it was the mission of Jesus. They opposed not Jesus, but the divine mission. Thus they all-Jews who succeeded to put Jesus on cross became liable of God's indignation and for eternal punishment in Hell. This is how Satan plays his role in making man in violating God's commandments.

#### Defensive measures-resorted by Jesus.

Jesus prepared his apostles with swords to attack the enemy if possible or at least for self defence if necessary.

*Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword; let him sell his garment, and buy one. -Luke 22:36*

He led them to his usual hiding place, where he appointed them to guard watchfully praying God for their safety.

*And they said, Lord behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough. And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of olives: and his disciples also followed him. And when he was at the place, he said unto them, pray that ye enter not into temptation. -Luke 22:38-40*

---

1. None from among the twelve apostles. But one disciple from among multitude of disciples who left following Jesus for fear of Jews. We have explained this point in our another book under caption-" Is Atonement Necessary for salvation?"

Jesus himself prayed God to save him from the ignominious death awaiting for him.

*And he was withdrawn from them about a stones cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup [death] from me: nevertheless not my will, but Thine be done. And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. -Luke 22:41-44*

Situation being thus, the enemy being led by one of his disciples approached them in a large number.

*And while he yet spake, behold a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them and drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the son of man with a kiss? -Luke 22:47-48*

Jesus ordered his disciples to run away while he himself too tried - seeing the great multitude.

*Rise, let us be going :behold, he is at hand that doth betray me. -Matthew 26:46*

But in vain. They could not move from there even an inch; as the enemy already came upon them.

*And while he yet spake, lo Judas, one of the twelve came and with him a great multitude with swords and staves from the chief priests and elders of the people. -Matthew 26:47*

"And while he yet spake..." means, the words of Jesus to his disciples ordering to run away were hardly completed than the enemy surrounded them.

**Judas kissed Jesus- not as his last tribute- but to disclose his identity.**

*Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast. -Matthew 26:48*

Does this not prove that Jesus disguised himself so as not to be betrayed of ?

.....nor let me go. -Luke 22:68

*This is the last clause of the verse Luke 22:68.*

This clause is excluded from urdu and telugu versions. However these words were spoken by Jesus when he was being interrogated by the enemy after his betrayal. These words unequivocally prove that he was not willing to be crucified but wanted to be set free.

(And further when he was put on cross) *he cried saying -My God, my God, Why hast Thou forsaken me? -Matthew 27:46*

If it were God's command or Jesus' wilful sacrifice for the redemption of mankind, there could have been no place for such utterances.

From the foregoing points, it is evident that the act of putting Jesus on cross was not a wilful offering of Jesus to fulfil the decree of God, but it was imposed as a punishment for the false accusations made by Jews who wanted to get rid of Jesus.

The involvement of satan in carrying out this act of crucifixion is a clear evidence that it was not divine sacrifice for the redemption of mankind offered by Jesus as a ransom, but a horrible device of Satan. But Paul preached the crucifixion of Jesus as a divine sacrifice for the redemption of people.

All disciples had been carrying out the mission of preaching in strict accordance with the instructions they had been commissioned with by Jesus.

*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. -Matthew 28:19-20*

From above we see that Jesus ordered the disciples to preach what all he had exhorted them to do.

**Now let us examine what he had exhorted his disciples to do, in brief.**

*A) Then spake Jesus to the multitude and to his disciples, Saying The scribes and the pharisees sit in Moses' seat : All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.*

*-Matthew 23:1-3*

From the above passage one can understand that Jesus never preached an other religion such as christianity but he himself followed and exhorted to follow the religion that was existing in his time. And this is the reason why he commanded his followers to obey the scribes and pharisees and to do according to their biddings. The only difference is that the Jews did not believe on Jesus as a prophet sent for their reformation. This is why he ordered his disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, the Holy Spirit and of himself (Matthew 28:19) but not in the sense to preach a new religion of his own.

Now let us have a glance over the reformations.

*'Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, Judgment, mercy and faith: These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone . Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. -Matthew 23:23-24*

Nowhere Jesus had said that he would ransom his life for the sins of people. We have discussed in our foregoing arguments that how Jesus insisted upon observance of the law and righteousness to get eligibility to enter into the kingdom of God. This convincingly prove that the doctrine of Ransom-Redemption etc. as professed by Paul is in contrast with the teachings of Jesus and his apostles.

Let us have a glance over false teachers:

And again Jesus fore- warned his disciples to be careful about the false preachers and to be saved from being deceived of them.

Thus we read

*Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit: But a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire; wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. -Matthew 7:15-20*

This is to say that many people would come in guise of followers of Jesus and mislead people. So whosoever preach against or that which does not conform with the teachings of the twelve apostles cannot be the real teachings of Jesus. Exactly as has been prophesied, Paul began to preach all contrary to the teachings of Jesus claiming himself to be an apostle of Jesus appointed for Gentiles. What more pitiable than ridiculous is the attitude of present christianity, who verify the authenticity of any point in the teachings of Paul keeping aside the teachings of Jesus.

Thus in the churches of Peter, Paul might have entered and preached the doctrine of cross and death of Jesus as Ransom and Redemption.

Knowing this Peter (or his people) went to all those places where their people had been found attracted to the teachings of Paul-and mended them by showing all these points which we have pointed out. As they were the immediate disciples of Jesus who followed him right from the beginning and who knew all about his real teachings and about the truth what really had happened, could be able to convince them. But the matter ended not there by itself. To get them back on his side Paul, of course did not personally visit there for anticipatory manhandling, but wrote the epistles convincing his dogmas<sup>1</sup>. The following verse is taken from his letter to Galatians as an example which testify to our argument.

*O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? -Galatians 3:1*

---

1. Paul wrote letters repeatedly so as to attract the believers towards his Church.  
Colossians 2:1+4:16 Philippians 3:1 + 18 2nd Corinthians 10:9-10

## 5) Doctrine of Jesus' Resurrection as preached by paul.

- A) That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. -Romans 10:9
- B) Who [Jesus] was delivered for our offences and was raised again for our justification. -Romans 4:25
- C) Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead: and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you is Christ -Acts 17:3
- D) Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel. -II Timothy 2:8
- E) For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words. -I Thessalonians 4:14-18

From the foregoing passages we understand Paul to have preached the doctrine of Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And it is not general resurrection but the immediate resurrection of Jesus from his (supposed) death on cross, after three days. And at the same time he speaks of the General Resurrection also, on which day according to him those that slept (died) in Jesus, shall be raised first and those that remain alive shall accompany him. He did not say any thing about the non-christians. However, he means as saying that those christians that remain alive by the time of general resurrection will be caught up in the air to receive their Lord along with those that slept in Jesus who would have been raised first. Thus those that remain alive will remain for ever and ever without undergoing the general process of death and resurrection. Before we think of the

Resurrection of Jesus, let us first think about General Resurrection as proclaimed by him. According to Gospel of John, Jesus' second manifestation is appointed, to raise the dead for judgment.

Thus we read in John.

*Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation. -John 5:28-29*

The above verses prove that Jesus would come on the day of Resurrection to raise the dead from the graves for judgment. A known fact is that General Resurrection will take place only after the end of the world (Matthew 24:14). On that day every living being and every thing will be destroyed. No life can escape from death. All mankind dies on that day with no exemption. After this, the general resurrection takes place. If this be the fact, where is the chance for some Christians to be present alive on the day of Resurrection so as to be caught up in the air to meet their Lord and to be alive with him for ever without undergoing the process of death as advocated by Paul?

Not only Paul preached this ridiculous doctrine that some Christians those that remain alive, accompany Jesus together with the resurrected Christians, and remain with him for ever in this mortal body, without undergoing the general process of death and resurrection, but also indirectly suggested to preach this among Christians by saying in the last verse of this passage which reads as follows.

*“Therefore comfort one another with these words.”*

This is an open blunder which Paul committed, which worked as a fuel to fire and perturbed the church of Peter.

Now let us examine about the Resurrection of Jesus:

It is recorded by John in his Gospel that Jesus to have said as below.

*Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. -John 10:17-18*

Thus we find the doctrine of Paul about the wilful death of Jesus, and his resurrection after three days, as to have been justified by Jesus himself.

**But his attitude was contrary:**

Jesus earnestly prayed God to save him from death.

*Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup [death] pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. -Matthew 26:38-39*

If he were the man appointed as ransom for the sins of people, when that good opportunity of getting it fulfilled had attained, could he ever have said-

*‘My soul is exceeding sorrowful?’* No. But should have said, “the hour for which I have been sent into this world- has approached. It is a precious day for me. So I am very happy. Let it be fulfilled with no obstacles.” On the contrary he prayed God to save him from the death awaiting.

If this be the attitude of Jesus, can the words such as have been recorded in the passage under discussion<sup>1</sup>, be regarded to have been really spoken by Jesus?

**Jesus disguised himself so as not to be traced and betrayed.**

*Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; hold him fast. -Matthew 26:48*

This verse discloses the fact that Jesus remained in disguise. Had he been really the person appointed to be crucified for the sins of many could ever he had disguised himself so as not to be traced and betrayed and put on cross?

---

1. John 10:17-18

## Self defensive measures resorted to: by Jesus.

He ordered his disciples to acquire swords, even by selling their garments in case if they did not have them.

*Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.* -Luke 22:36

*And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough.* -Luke 22:38

## Attempted to run away:

He ordered his disciples to run away, while he himself too attempted to run away.

*Rise, let us be going: behold he is at hand, That doth betray me.*  
-Matthew 26:46

## Earnestly expresses his wish to be set free even after his betrayal.

*.....nor let me go.(Luke 22:68)*

*note:- These words are excluded from Telugu and urdu versions.*

If he were “the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world(John 1:29)” could ever he expressed his wish to be released from the hands of the butcher (enemy) even before to his sacrifice?

Finally on the cross, when he was reaching to his last moment, he said-

*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?<sup>1</sup>* - is a clear testimony that he was not willing for death on cross.

The empirical inference, from the attitude of Jesus, is clear that he was not sent for the ignominious death on cross as a ransom for the sins of people. Do all excerpts as have been pointed out above not prove that

---

1. Matthew 27:46

what is recorded in the passage under discussion saying as Jesus to have said “*Because I lay down my life that I might take it again; No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.*”<sup>2</sup> as that Jesus could never have really said?

Let us for a while agree that what all has been recorded in the passage under discussion, showing that Jesus to have said, as true. Now what our contention is-if his death on cross and immediate resurrection that followed after three days were correct, according as to the sensational propagation of paul, could ever Jesus dreaded to under go death saying - ‘**My soul is exceeding sorrowful?**’ No. Because such death is not at all a real death- but only an interval (rest) between his death and resurrection after three days . But he dreaded as if he were dying even before death.

*My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.*

-Matthew 26:38

Do all these points not show that Jesus had no vestige knowledge of his(supposed)resurrection after his(supposed)death on cross?

But contrary to these facts, paul has reiterated---

- 1) The swoon of Jesus on cross as his death (as his wilful sacrifice as ransom for our sins) and
- 2) his resussitation from the swoon as his resurrection that immediately followed after three days, and
- 3) his departure to the other ten tribes of Israelites who were scattered abroad -as his bodily ascension and
- 4) about his second coming to Judge the people. One can see all these altogether, or at least anyone of them as taking the prominent place in all his teachings and epistles, repeatedly.

## Death of Jesus? (And his) Resurrection?

No doubt that when Jesus was put on cross he went into swoon. All his immediate disciples also thought him to be really dead. His body was handed down to one of his secret disciples by name Joseph of

---

2. John 10:17-18

Arimathae who knowing that the life was not yet extinct, took him and gave medical treatment secretly so that this fact of his being alive should not be noticed by his enemy for fear of further attack. This was the reason that why his disciples too did not believe, when they heard that Jesus was alive.

A) *And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.* -Mark 16:11

B) *And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them.* -Mark 16:13

C) *Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.* -Mark 16:14

'Risen' of the above verse (Mark 16:14) means "risen from bed (of treatment)" but not from death (Grave). It is used only in a figurative sense. We should not take it in literal sense.

We have a good example that how the words such as 'death' and 'life' are used figuratively for sin (transgression) and repentance (forgiveness) respectively.

*We read from Luke 15:10-32.*

A man had two sons. Younger son separated from his father and took away his share and went to a far country where he spent away all that he had, enjoying lavishly with harlots. He became so helpless as he feared that he would be famished to death. So he returned to his father asking for his forgiveness and to accept him not as a son but as a servant.

Then the father forgave his son and received him with great love and affection saying to his people- "Make merry....."

*For this my son was dead, and is alive again.....* -Luke 15:24

And repeated the same words entreating his elder son who became angry seeing his brother being given hearty reception.

*For this thy brother was dead and is alive again...* -Luke 15:32

Had Jesus really died and been risen, there could have been no further threat of death or attack of enemy. So Jesus taking this advantage could have freely preached appearing to all people at all times. But he remained in disguise as many days as he stayed there before leaving for the ten tribes of Israelites, who scattered abroad. He met his people in secret being in disguise and when he made sure of their privacy, then only he used to disclose his identity.

Thus we read from the following:

A) *And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Mary, She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni... -John 20:14-16*

Further take note of the words--

She supposing him to be gardener --Why?

Because he was in disguise of the gardener.

Not only he disguised his person but also his voice. When he asked her the first time 'Why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? ..... she could not understand that it was Jesus' voice. But when he called her with his normal voice in the second time of the same event, she identified him to be Jesus. Thus he disguised both his voice and person.

B) *After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.* -Mark 16:12

His remaining in disguise is another proof to say that he did not die nor was he resurrected but resuscitated from his swoon.

### Scripture Fulfilled:

*When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said , It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.*

*The Jews therefore because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbathday, (For that sabbath day was an high day) besought pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. -John 19:30-33*

They did not break the legs of Jesus so that the scripture might be fulfilled.

*For these things were done , that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. -John 19:36*

Scripture says that “even his bone cannot be broken.”

If this be the fact according to scripture, “How can one cause him to die?”

### Blood and Water Gushed forth.

*But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. -John 19:34*

A sure testimony to say that he was not dead but alive. Blood gushes forth only from the living body. In dead, blood clots.

Thus his swoon was mistaken for his death.

### Was the (SUPPOSED) resurrected body of Jesus a natural entity or spiritual?

Paul himself gives a brief contrast between a natural body and a spiritual one.

*So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonour: It is raised in glory: It is sown in weakness: It is raised in power: It is sown a natural body: It is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. -I Corinthians 15:42-44*

Keeping in view of this contrast let us find out whether the body of Jesus, as is being preached as resurrected one, had the qualities of a natural body or of a spiritual body.

### Natural body: Not Spiritual : Rebuts Resurrection.

It is already explained that when Jesus was put on cross, he went into unconsciousness. This state of his was mistaken for his death. Joseph of Arimathiae noticed that life was not extinct. He managed to keep him in his hewn grave and thus it was impressed to believe that he had been buried and the matter had come to an end. He (Joseph) managed to give medical treatment secretly<sup>1</sup>. As the injuries Jesus sustained were not so serious as to make him remain in bed for months together, but minor injuries and hence he could survive within few days. He came out in disguise to meet his near and dear. When he made sure of their privacy, then he used to disclose his identity. First he appeared to Mary Magdalene who told his disciples that Jesus was alive and had been seen of her. They were under strong impression that he had already been dead. And what the general impression is that the dead cannot come until the day of Resurrection.

### They thought him to be Sprit:

*And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a sprit. And he said unto them, why are ye troubled? And why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself,*

---

1. We have discussed this point elaborately in our another book “Isaiah 53”

*handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. -Luke 24:36-40*

From this passage one can notice that the disciples of Jesus were terribly afraid on seeing Jesus thinking him to be a Spirit. Had he ever told about his resurrection, could the disciples have not remembered and regarded him to be resurrected Jesus? Instead they thought him to be a Spirit. Then he showed his hands and feet means he showed the prints and the marks of his wounds. On seeing these (though they were healed to some extent) marks they could identify him as (real) Jesus himself. Having his wounds and bruises (or even the prints of them) makes it clear that no transformation of natural body to Spiritual body was made. This is the main point in the process of undergoing resurrection, which we miss to find in the case of Jesus. Hence the theory of Resurrection of Jesus as preached by Paul is ruled out.

Now let us examine another passage.

*But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them, when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.*

*-John 20:24-27*

From the above passage also one can see that Jesus' body was not transformed to spiritual body, but remained with the natural faculties as same as it was at the time of his burial.

This reveals that Jesus did not die nor was he resurrected. But he went into coma and after he was medically treated, he recouped his normal health.

Resurrected body must be free from the weakness of a natural body. But we find the body of Jesus in weakness of the natural body with wounds

or its prints and marks. Thus there was no resurrection. He appeared after his burial means, as we say, he did not die on the cross. Scripture agrees with our argument as it says - "*He shall prolong his days*" (Isaiah 53:10). It does not say that he died on the cross and was resurrected after three days as is the contention of Paul, but says that he was conferred with the favour of "Long term of life"

Thus the misleading argument of Paul about Resurrection of Jesus was another point for the rivalry between the Church of Paul and Peter's.

As regards to the subject of resurrection let us examine some other passages in addition to what have already been discussed.

## WHAT IS RESURRECTION ?

After death men shall not live again until the day of Resurrection-a general rule.

*But man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. -Job 14:10-12*

*When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I shall not return. -Job 16:22*

*The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up. -1 Samuel 2:6*

*And he said, While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept: for I said, Who can tell whether God will be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me. -2 Samuel 12:22-23*

Resurrection is - possessing of life after ones own death. In general terms it is applicable to the general resurrection, which is an appointed day on which the whole mankind will be raised to appear before God for the judgment of their deeds. People generally cannot believe in it. Man after his death becomes dust. In such a state possessing of life and rising in the former body is of course a matter beyond one's own com-

prehension. Therefore in some exceptional cases, some dead people were raised as miracles made by the prophets and some by God Himself as a token in the ability of His raising the dead to life on the day of general resurrection. We have such many a number of illustrations in the Bible<sup>1</sup>. But what a curious fact is that such raised ones to life after death, will (did) not remain for ever, but die (died) again who will not raise until the day of General Resurrection. Only on the day of General Resurrection, all that rose shall have their former bodies, transformed into a state such as to live for ever and ever.

### SOME GOSPEL RECORDS MENTION JESUS TO HAVE PROCLAIMED ABOUT HIS RESURRECTION - EXAMINED

Now the question is whether Jesus had ever foretold that he would resurrect himself after his (supposed) death on cross after three days after his burial.

As regards to this, gospel records are inconsistent. But all of them agree his Resurrection.

Now let us examine some passages as recorded in Gospels to have been proclaimed by Jesus.

*A) Then answered the Jews and said unto him, what sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them "destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" then saith the Jews Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said.*  
-John 2:18-22

From the above passage one can notice Jesus to have allegorically foretold about his resurrection saying as that he would destroy the temple of God and build it in three days.

---

1. I Kings 17:17-24      II Kings 4:32-37      Matthew 9:23-26 ; 27:52  
 Luke 7:11-15      John 11:32-45

But what surprising to note is that Matthew and Mark denied its authenticity by recording the following passages in their Gospels.

*B) Now the chief priests, and elders and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death: But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses. And said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.*  
-Matthew 26:59-61 and (Mark 14:57-59)

In these passages Matthew and Mark clearly admitted that destroying of temple and building it within three days as false statement and untruth, describing it as the statement of false witnesses. Statement of false witnesses means -accusation against Jesus for what he did not say. Thus the statement of John 2:18-22 is contradicted by Matthew and Mark.

Now what more humorous is -the gospel writers Matthew and Mark have contradicted their own records as cited under reference Matthew 26:59-61 and Mark 14:57-59 respectively as false by incorporating the following statements in their gospels.

*C) Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand and another on the left. And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself, if thou be the son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders said, He saved others: himself he cannot save. If he be the king of Israel let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him. for he said, I am the son of God. The thieves also which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth.*  
-Matthew 27:38-44 and also refer Mark 15:27-32

In this passage we find the two thieves who were put on cross one on right side and the other on left side of Jesus, and the passers by and the chief priests, scribes and elders proclaimed that Jesus had said that he would destroy the temple of God and build it within three days.

This statement of so many people goes to prove that Jesus had really proclaimed that he would destroy the temple and build it within three

days referring to his death on cross and his resurrection after three days. Thus the above three passages ABC remain self contradictory. Grave inconsistency among them is obvious.

Surprisingly enough in the Gospel of Luke, we find no record of false witnesses who accused that Jesus had told that he would destroy the temple and build it again within three days. Thus the Gospel records relating to the resurrection of Jesus rendered a great deal of inconsistency. yet all gospels converge on the point of Jesus' resurrection. The mystery behind this can be well imagined by means of empirical inference that all these records might have been manipulated by those that run after the pauline doctrines.

### SOME STATEMENTS REFUTE DOCTRINE OF JESUS' RESURRECTION

what another remarkable point is that according to Luke the two malefactors who were put on cross along with him did not deride him saying as *"Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days"*. (as recorded in Matthew 27:38-44 and Mark 15:27-32) respectively , but narrates quite differently as follows-

*A. And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, If thou be christ, save thyself and us. But the other answering rebuked him, saying Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed Justly: for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.*

*-Luke 23:39-43*

Contrary to the records as stated in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, one of the two rails against Jesus saying - *'If thou be Christ, save thyself and us.'* This is to mean as saying - "If you are really Christ as proclaimed by you, save yourself and us too" And the other thief earnestly requests Jesus saying as-- *"Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom"*. Jesus pleased very much with his attitude and assured him saying as- *"Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise"*.

Take note of the above saying of Jesus which rules out the false notion of the resurrection and of his sitting on the right hand of God. If he were really to resurrect, could ever he had said- *"Today thou shalt be with me in paradise"*?

As a matter of fact, when he was put on cross, seeing that death was inevitable, being a true prophet of God, Jesus expected that he would surely go to paradise. And consequently he assured the other malefactor that he would be with him (Jesus) in paradise the very same day. This goes to prove very convincingly that he had no least idea of (supposed) resurrection. Had he really proclaimed about his resurrection, having been in know of it, the wordings of his promise as made out to the malefactor must have been in different style which fact the readers can well speculate. In factual reality, what has been speculated as resurrection is no more than Jesus' miraculous escape from death.

Pertaining to this point one more passage from the Gospel of John may be taken in support of our arguments to refute the resurrection of Jesus.

*B. Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister Mary the wife of cleophas, and MaryMagdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved he saith unto to his mother, woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.*

*-John 19:25-27*

It is a known fact that Jesus used to go on journeys for preaching purpose for days together along with his disciples. But we find nowhere in any of the gospels, Jesus to have entrusted the responsibility of looking after his mother to any person in the situation such as of going on journey for some days.

But here what note worthy is, when Jesus was put on cross, we find in the above passage (John 19:25-27) that he entrusted the responsibility of looking after his mother to one of his disciples to whom he loved. Keeping in view of this fact, we would like to invite your attention towards the fact that if Jesus had least idea of his resurrection after three days (only three days), could ever he had entrusted the responsibility of looking after his mother to the disciple as if he was going to die for ever? No,

not at all. What the fact is when he was put on cross, as there was no idea of (supposed) resurrection at all, he handed over his mother to his disciple- not temporarily but for a permanent abode with disciple- not as the mother of his master but as his own mother and the disciple as her son. Does this point not rebut the fabrication as made out that Jesus had foretold his resurrection? This also discloses that he had no least idea that he would be conferred with the favour of a long term of life as prophesied by Isaiah... **he shall prolong his days** (Isaiah 53:10).

*C. And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first-day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. And they said among themselves, who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? -Mark 16:1-3*

The above passage shows that three ladies went to the sepulchre of Jesus with spices to anoint his body.

*Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments: And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen; remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, the son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words. -Luke 24:1-8*

In this passage we find the ladies who entered into the sepulchre were searching for the body of Jesus to anoint. But the two men (angels) in shining garments while according to Gospel Mark 16:5 only one young man, told them ... *why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying the son of man must be delivered unto the hands of sinful men and be crucified and the third day rise again. And they remembered his [Jesus] words* (Luke 24: 5-8)

From the above it is evident that the ladies were reminded by the two men (angels) in shining garments that what Jesus had told them while he was yet in Galilee, came to pass and accordingly he was risen. They believed and went to report the matter to his disciples. And what surprising is that the words and testimony of the ladies appeared to the disciples and all the rest as idle tales.

Thus we read from Luke 24:11

*And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.*

They believed them not -means they did not believe that Jesus had risen. Thus the doctrine of resurrection is described here as idle tale by the disciples. This goes to prove ultimately that the disciples (Peter's church) had never preached this doctrine. The attitude of Jesus is a strong testimony to prove that as we discussed so far, that there was no least idea of resurrection (as is supposed) at all to Jesus himself. This was the reason for not foretelling to his disciples about his resurrection. And perhaps this was the reason for disciples too in not believing in his resurrection. The inconsistent passages as recorded by the gospel writers is a strong testimony to prove that Jesus had not told that he would resurrect after three days after his death.

The foregoing arguments on the inconsistent passages regarding the resurrection of Jesus- some suggest that Jesus to have told people that he would rise after three days after his burial, while some other contradict. However the most important thing that should be taken into consideration to establish the fact is the attitude of the people in general and his disciples in particular. One's own attitude is the real reflection of the truth concerning on any one's own personal issue. Therefore as regards to the issue at hand, let us examine the attitude of people and of the disciples and of Jesus himself.

**Attitude of people:-** Had Jesus really told people that he would rise on the third day, would this news not have spread all over Judea and other places? And would people in great number have not come to his sepulchre to witness this great miracle ever done? In this regard let us recall to our minds the incident of Jesus' raising the dead Lazarus to life. After knowing this fact people from among the surroundings gathered there to see not only Jesus, but also dead Lazarus whom Jesus raised and many believed in Jesus too<sup>1</sup>. If this be the attitude of people, how much more

1. John 11:1-45 + 12:9-11

commotion and ado would have been taken place to witness yet a far greater miracle of Jesus' rising to life after his death on third day? Had anybody come there? None. Does this attitude of people not prove that Jesus had never told the people that he would resurrect? What the fact is that his miraculous escape from death has been given colour of resurrection.

**Attitude of the disciples:-** When they heard of Mary Magdalene and other ladies that Jesus had been seen of them, the disciples not only not believed their words but mocked at them.

Thus we read.

*And their words seemed to them as idle tales and they believed them not.* -Luke 24:11

Does this point not prove that the disciples had no least idea and knowledge of their master's resurrection? Had Jesus told them that he would rise on third day would they have not given wide publicity? And as a result, would people in great number as well as the disciples themselves have not assembled at the sepulchre of Jesus to welcome their resurrected master?

But what surprising is that there came none at the sepulchre of Jesus, except four or five ladies who went there to anoint the body of Jesus with ointments and spices. This speaks that the miraculous escape of Jesus from death was given the colour of Resurrection.

**Attitude of Jesus:-** Had Jesus been really resurrected, there could have been no further threat of being attacked and of any humiliations from enemy. And Jesus could have utilized this opportunity and preached the gospel openly in a challenging manner. But did he appear to anybody except to his own disciples only on three or four occasions that too in disguise?<sup>1</sup> Does this point not lead to arrive at to conclude that he had escaped from death on cross and remained all the days there in underground and in disguise for fear of further attack by the enemy?

---

1. The points on his disguise have been discussed earlier.

A) When he was put on cross he handed over his mother under guardianship of his disciple<sup>1</sup>, a sure testimony that he had no idea and knowledge that he would escape death and survive.

B) And his assurance to the malefactor that he would be with him (Jesus) in paradise the same day<sup>2</sup>, underlines more on certainty of his death rather than of escape from it. Contrary to these facts the claim of Church that he had foretold about his resurrection cannot be accepted

Resurrection here may be taken to mean in the figurative sense for escaping from death and for survival. Very often we hear from the people who narrowly escape from death after their serious illness, saying as "This is my second life-" meaning resurrection according to biblical terminology. All these points go to prove unequivocally that Jesus had never expected of life after his death on cross. But God saved him from the death on cross which was later propagated as his resurrection to agree with the invented doctrines.

Had he prophesied that he would resurrect, was it not incumbent upon him to manifest himself before people, so that his prophecy as made out by him should be established? He remained in underground and in disguise not being seen of public (people other than his near and dear)- then does it make any difference whether he be in grave dead or kept himself hidden out of the grave though alive? Who knows whether he was resurrected or became dust being the dust (man)?

Keeping in view of all the above points, we appeal to the readers to examine carefully the following event as recorded under two halves under two passages respectively.

### **The first half:-**

*"Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and pharisees came together unto pilate, saying sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: So the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said*

---

1. John 19:25-27

2. Luke 23:39-43

*unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can.  
So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and  
setting a watch. -Matthew 27:62-66*

From the above passage we can see that the chief priests etc. went to the Governor and appealed to command that the sepulchre of Jesus be made sure until the third day. They expressed their doubt saying that his disciples might come by night and steal the body of Jesus and say to the people, "He is risen from the dead." Thus they appealed because they remembered that Jesus had told that he would be raised from the dead after three days. In compliance with the appeal of the Jews, Pilate (Governor) said, that there was guard appointed already, (or) "you have your watch which may be appointed to safeguard the sepulchre," The watch (guard) appointed at the sepulchre is not clear whether they were of Governor's watch or of chief priests'. There is ambiguity in English and Telugu versions while urdu version makes it clear that the watch (guard) was of priests' which is further supported by the verse 66 of the passage in general. But an examination of the verse from the second half (Mat 28:11-15) it can be well decided that they were the soldiers of the governor. Really if they were the soldiers of Governor (according to Mat 28:11-15) one wonders to note the strange practice with out a former precedent of keeping a guard at the sepulchres of people. If it was not with all other people the question comes that why particularly in the case of Jesus? The request of priests to appoint guard is reasonable as they were under dismay that the disciples of Jesus might come and steal the body and tell to the people "He is risen"

Now the main question that cross in one's own mind is that how the priests could know that the disciples would come by night and steal the body.

For this we have an answer in this passage "*sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.*"

"We remember" say the priests--

But in factual reality the disciples themselves did not believe when they heard the saying of the ladies that Jesus had been seen of them. And yet they mocked remarking their saying as 'idle tales'.

The request of priests to appoint guard--

Was it because they really believed that Jesus would resurrect and hence they wanted the guard to arrest him in the sepulchre so that the resurrected one might be famished to death?

No- they believed not in the resurrection of Jesus.

But they speculated that the disciples might come by night and steal the body of Jesus-and tell the people "*He is risen*". So, they intended to keep the guard to prevent the disciples from stealing the body of Jesus. Now the question comes that when the priests were appealing the Governor to appoint guard at the sepulchre, why did they repose their confidence in the resurrection of Jesus saying as-

*Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive,  
After three days I will rise again. -Matthew 27:63*

As regards to this my humble reply is that if this verse were really authentic, could they further have expressed their doubt in continuation to their appeal to the Governor as follows?.

*...lest his disciples come by night and steal him away and say unto the people, "he is risen from the dead..."*

From this it is clear that the body of Jesus remains dead only. This rules out their repose in resurrection. His disciples come by night and steal the body. Stealing of the dead body is possible- but living body cannot be stolen but be abducted. In case of Jesus and his disciples the word abduction also does not suit. Abduction means carrying away the unwilling person by force. Were he really to resurrect no need of stealing the body nor of abduction of Jesus' person. He himself could come out and appear before people saying, 'Lo I am risen'. Keeping in view of all these points the readers can well judge the authenticity of the verse under reference Matthew 27:63. In fact these are not the words spoken by Jews to Pilate, but later addition by the church so as to make believe the present Christians as that Jesus had really foretold about his resurrection.

Before we examine the second half Matthew 28:11-15, let us have a glance over the preamble as recorded in Matthew 28:1-8.

Let us bear in mind that what actually had happened. The ladies came to see the sepulchre. There was great earthquake, Angel descended. His countenance was like lightening and his raiment was white as snow.

And for fear of him the keepers (guard) did shake and became as dead. And the angel answered and said unto the women 'Fear not ye': for I know that ye seek Jesus which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen as he said, come see the place where the lord lay(Matthew 28:1-6).

Thus on seeing the angel the guard became like dead. But ladies were bold enough to see the angel. Perhaps mere warning of him saying "fear ye not" made them bold enough. He reported the ladies that Jesus had been raised and showed them the place where he was laid down.

### Now come to the second half:

*Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day (Mathew 28:11-15).*

In this passage we find the priests offering large money to the guards for two purposes. One to hide the facts what really had taken place and the other to say that the disciples of Jesus came by night and stole him away while they were asleep.

**Empty tomb:** Means a tomb where in there is no body of the dead. Is empty tomb a criterion either to establish or reject the resurrection of Jesus? In the preamble to this passage<sup>1</sup> we find the angel showing the empty place(empty tomb) to the ladies in confirmation to the resurrection while we find in this passage the elders abetting the soldiers to say that the body of Jesus had been stolen away by his disciples. Thus in both cases the empty tomb became criterion to establish their view points one in favour and the other against to the point of Resurrection.

Now the question is - do people inspect the tomb so as to make sure of his resurrection if only his body is not found?. No, but what most desirable is that he should appear before people.

---

1. Matthew 28:1-8

**Magic in Logic:** Whether this saying<sup>1</sup> is commonly reported among the Jews until this day(Mat 28:15) or not, is not the point- but what a curious fact is - we hear frequently from christian pastors shouting that how could the soldiers who were sleeping witness that his disciples stole away the body of Jesus ? They logically pose to the audience and in return audience give applause. On careful examination of the events as recorded, one cannot miss to determine that these are nothing but later developments added in support of the pauline doctrines by the pauline church.Jesus and his apostles have no concern at all.

### LAW AND THE STAND OF PAUL

Now let us examine the stand of Paul on the divine law, which became another major factor for the rivalry between the churches of Peter and of Paul.

Paul was accused of preaching against to the divine law saying as " This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law<sup>2</sup>."

Now the question is whether it was mere accusation or in factual reality his attitude had been contrary to the law.

### DEFINITION OF LAW

In general terms law means certain rules and regulations formed by the nation in the interest of its subjects which safeguards the human rights.It orders to do and prohibits not to do certain deeds,which altogether carry the reciprocal benefits of human beings. It consists of two main parts -(A) Criminal Procedure Code and (B) Civil Procedure Code. However these two altogether constitute the law of the country. To be a good citizen of the country one has to abide by the law and those who tread against to it are liable for punishment.

But in religious terminology law means the divine injunctions given by God Almighty through Holy Spirit to the prophets who in turn convey and explain to the people. And those who follow the divine law meticulously are eligible for Heavenly reward and contrary to this who disobey are liable for Hell punishment.

---

1. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: [say ye, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept] and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day. -2. Acts 18:12-13

Divine law is also consists of two important parts --

- A) that which deals with faith and beliefs and the other -  
B) which deals with safeguarding of the human(people's) rights.

If the first part (A) of the divine law is excluded the second part(B) covers the nation's complete code of conduct which regulates in safeguarding of the citizen's rights. Punishments as suggested in divine law for the transgression of the law may vary from that of nation's - while any criminal(sinner) may possibly escape the national punishment in some occasions but cannot escape from God's punishment. In a nutshell it may be imputed that the nation's law is nothing but the divine law excluded of that part which deals with faith and beliefs(A). If the point of belief on God, prophets, revelation and the day of judgment etc., is set aside one can hardly fail to ascertain that the Divine law and the national law(of any country) as identical in every respect except in some points such as tax, usury, wine etc., The atheists also give due respect to this second Part(B) of divine law though not in the status of divine law but at least as his nation's law. Antinationalists also cannot violate this law because it effects his own person, family or neighbour. Yet more curious fact is, a lay man who is ignorant of Divine law as well as national law, but good in conduct and nature and lover of his fellow beings also cannot violate this law(B). This speaks that God has bestowed this law(B) in every human being as an innate gift that inspires towards safeguarding of human rights<sup>1</sup>. It is a different thing that man succumbs to his weakness and violates this law despite his instinct warnings.If any one propagates not to observe this law(B), he is indirectly suggesting to violate the national law. For example "steal not" is divine injunction. If any one dare say any thing against to it, action may be taken against him by the government though such Governments are formed even by atheists. Because he is abetting people to work against the national law. Thus he is treated as antinational or in other words traitor though not as an atheist. Thus nobody can openly violate the second part of the divine law(B) while the first part(A) which deals with faith and beliefs is at one's own liberty either to accept or reject. And this was the reason why Paul did not speak against the law that comes under category B. which is obeyed even by the atheists. And this point became a shield for the present christians to uphold that Paul was not against to the law.

---

1. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness...

-Romans 2:14-15

## CIRCUMCISION - COMES UNDER LAW - CATEGORY - A

In between these two there are some injunctions given by God Almighty which do not effect the human rights under section(B) but reflects as the corollary to the faith under section(A). They are for example(1) Circumcision<sup>2</sup>(for males only) (2) covering of body by a Veil<sup>3</sup>(only for females) (3) Regulations on some foods(in general) etc. However these come under section(A) because without faith and belief in God and His commandments one cannot observe these customs.

### Circumcision :

*for circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law..*

*-Romans 2:25*

The above is a precept written to Romans by Paul in his epistle.

The obvious fact from the above is - the custom of circumcision is attempted to be excluded from the divine law. This is just to diminish the importance of it. Whatever God ordained - it is a law, may it be for an individual or any community; let us examine whether the violation of it comes under the purview of violation of the divine law or not from the following statements.

- 1) *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law. - I John 3:4*

from the above it is clear that violation of the law is sin. In other words one who attained sin has violated the law.

- 2) *Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world...*

*-Romans 5:12*

In the above it is admitted that Adam had acquired sin. Acquiring of sin is a clear indication that he had violated the law. The known fact is that there was no specific list of law given to Adam. But God ordained him not to eat the fruit of the forbidden tree. He transgressed that order. And hence sin entered. Does this not prove that Adam transgressed the

---

2. Genesis 17:10-14

3. (veil) Genesis 24:65, 38:14; Song of Solomon 5:7, Ruth 3:15

divine order which was termed as law even as according to the exposition of statements under points 1&2 ? In this way every order of God is a law, transgression of which leads to the acquisition of sin.

**CIRCUMCISION :** It is cutting of the flesh of the foreskin. An obligatory physical rite ordained for males, by God Almighty, through Abraham the father of nations.<sup>1</sup>

Circumcision is a must for every such stranger as one who wishes to partake in passover feast. To say in clear terms that unless one is circumcised he cannot partake in passover feast<sup>2</sup>. It is an ordained feast to be observed by every believer<sup>3</sup>. These points disclose the importance and necessity of undergoing the circumcision to be a perfect believer.

And according to Peter's church one cannot be saved unless one is circumcised<sup>4</sup>.

From among one sect of the Jews pharisees who believed in Jesus, disputed that circumcision must be done to everyone that believed on Jesus even from Gentiles<sup>5</sup>.

#### Attitude of Paul towards circumcision.

And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren and --said, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved.

Paul and Barnabas disagreed with them :

*And when therefore paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them...*<sup>6</sup>

These two verses make it clear that Paul and Barnabas had an angry disagreement and disputation with them that ordered the new comers from the Gentiles that they should be circumcised after the manner of Moses. This further discloses that Paul(and his party) were dead against to the rite of circumcision. In consideration with this fact it goes without saying that they were preaching people not to circumcise their children.

---

1. Genesis 17:9-14    2. Exodus 12:48    3. Exodus 12:24-28  
4. Acts 15:1    5. Acts 15:5    6. Acts 15:1-2.

*And they are informed of thee[Paul] that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children neither to walk after the customs.    - Acts. 21:21*

Thus from the above passage it became evident that Paul was preaching that circumcision was not necessary. And again Paul stresses not to observe the rite of circumcision :

A) *Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage*<sup>1</sup>.  
-Galatians. 5:1

B) *Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.*    -Galatians. 5:2

C) *For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love.*  
-Galatians. 5:6

If people who become the followers of Jesus taking him to be a saviour, are threatened that he would avail them nothing if they are circumcised, would they really undergo circumcision ? Not at all. This is why the christians as they are really Paulines(followers of Paul) are not observing this divine ordinance. This point shows very clearly that how irresistibly Paul had played his divices against to the ordinance of circumcision.

#### Paul defines the circumcision.

A) *For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly ; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh.*

*But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit and not in the letter ; whose praise is not of men, but of God.*    -Romans. 2:28,29

B) *What advantage then hath the Jew ? or what profit is there of circumcision ?*    -Romans. 3:1

---

1. Yoke of bondage means "yoke of circumcision" (Acts 15:1-11)

circumcision is not that which is outward in the flesh. But circumcision is that of the heart in the Spirit and not in the letter(not physical, outwardly apparent) and says such outward circumcision profits nothing. This is how he(Paul)has defined the circumcision in the above passages.

### A good advice by Paul ?

A) *Is any man called being circumcised ? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision ? let him not be circumcised. -I Corinthians. 7:18*

B) *Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. -I Corinthians 7:19*

Had Paul been the contemporary of Abraham, he would definitely have advised him(Abraham) not to undergo circumcision, as he was called while in uncircumcision. Not knowing the mystery of circumcision as disclosed in various places by Paul, poor Abraham circumcised himself and Ishmael and all other male members who were under his care, the self same day on which the covenant was made<sup>1</sup>.

According to the second passage, Paul expresses that the point of circumcision is nothing, but following of commandments is more important. This shows that in view of Paul circumcision is not a commandment of God.

### Contrast between God and Paul :

GOD says :

A. *And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. -Genesis 17:9*

Literal meaning of the word " covenant " is agreement. Agreements generally are made between two parties. The parties(persons) thus entered into agreement are morally and legally responsible to carry out and fulfil every point that is mentioned and agreed upon in the agreement.

---

1. Genesis 17:24-27

In the above passage God makes a covenant with Abraham which does not cease with his person or his contemporary household members but his entire progeny has been involved in it. Thus God has made an indirect covenant with the progeny of Abraham that comes in generation after generation.

PAUL says :

*For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision ; but faith which worketh by love. -Galatians 5:6*

GOD says :

B. *This is my Covenant, which ye shall keep,between me and you and thy seed after thee ; Every manchild among you shall be circumcised. -Genesis. 17:10*

**Conditions :**

1. This Covenant is between me and you and thy seed after thee.
2. Every man child among you shall be circumcised.

Though the word 'progeny' covers both males and females the above condition(No.2) by word 'malechild', excluded female child(females) from observing this covenant. Yet they are responsible to get their male children circumcised. Thus though they are physically exempted, as their natural physical system is contrary to that of males, they are spiritually involved indirectly in the covenant.

PAUL says :

*Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. -Galatians 5:1*

Paul opines that they have been liberated from the bondage of circumcision by Christ and hence advises to abstain from undergoing it.

GOD says :

C. *And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin : and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. -Genesis 17:11*

In this we find the third point of the terms and conditions of the covenant. It explains the mode and procedure as how to circumcise, by specifically saying as 'cutting of the flesh' of the foreskin.

PAUL says :

*..... and circumcision is that of the heart in the Spirit and not in the letter[flesh]... -Romans 2:29*

GOD says :

*D. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every manchild in your generations, he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. -Genesis. 17:12*

In this condition two more points have been made clear.

- 1) Manchild in your generations, he that is born in the house.
- 2) And he that is bought with money from any stranger, which is not of thy seed. Eight days of age is specifically mentioned.

Thus these two points make clear that those who are born in the family or those that are bought from others who are not his seed - thus every manchild whosoever comes under one's care should be circumcised at the age of eight days.

PAUL says :

*....What profit is there of circumcision ? -Romans 3:1*

GOD says :

*E. He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. -Genesis. 17:13*

From the above passage it is made clear that the circumcision in the flesh is an everlasting covenant with no exemption. Thus this is the sixth point of the covenant which makes clear that this covenant is made for circumcision in the physical body of manchild in his flesh of foreskin.

PAUL says :

*.....neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. -Romans 2:28*

This is to mean as saying that the circumcision which is made outwardly in the flesh is not at all a real circumcision.

F. God says : Everlasting covenant. -Genesis. 17:13

Paul says: Christ made you free. -Galatians. 5:1

GOD says :

*G. And the uncircumcised manchild whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people : he hath broken my covenant. -Genesis. 17:14*

This is the last point of the conditions laid down in the agreement (Covenant). God says in clear terms that if any one is not circumcised, he shall be cut off from his people.

PAUL says :

*Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. -Galatians. 5:2*

Thus Paul contradicts the command of God, and threatens people of forfeiture of Christ's profit if they are circumcised.

According to God, if one fails to get oneself circumcised one shall be cut off from his people - "because he hath broken my covenant." (Genesis 17:14).

According to Paul if one undergoes circumcision, Christ shall not be of any profit to oneself (Galatians 5:2).

Abraham obeyed God :

*And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of the Abraham's house; and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the self sameday as God had said unto him.*

*And Abraham was ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. - Genesis. 17:23-24*

Isaac was circumcised :

*And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac being eight days old, as God had commanded him. - Genesis. 21:4*

John was circumcised :

*And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child ; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father.*

*And his mother answered and said, Not so ; but he shall be called John. - Luke. 1:59,60*

Jesus was circumcised :

*And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb. -Luke 2:21*

Paul's threat(doctrine) that "if one be circumcised oneself forfeits the profit of Jesus" is taken for consideration the fate of Abraham, Ishmail, Isaac, John (and even Jesus) will be miserable having been deprived of the profit of Jesus as advocated by Paul (Galatians 5:2)

God's threat(covenant)" that if one be uncircumcised oneself shall be cut off from his people " is taken for consideration Paul's and his follower's fate will be miserable having been dropped from the posterity of Abraham forfeiting all the profits of the promises made to Abraham.

Now let us discuss some important passages relating to law :

Law is ordained by God :

*A) Iam the Lord your God : walk in my statutes and keep my judgments, and do them. (Ezekiel 20:19)*

*B) What thing soever I command you, observe to do it : Thou shalt not add thereto,nor diminish from it. -Deuteronomy 12:32*

Apart from a number of commandments to follow the law, we have taken above two passages as specimen which establish the fact that law must be followed. It cannot be altered. Neither something can be added to it nor be diminished from it.

### What Jesus says about law ?

*A. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven : but whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.  
-Mathew 5:19*

*B. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. -Mathew 28:19-20*

### The stand of Paul on law :

*A) For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law : and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law. For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. -Romans 2:11-13*

*B) Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God ? -Romans 2:23*

From the above passages it is evident that Paul gives emphasis for the observance of the law.

### He changed his tune :

*A) And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.  
-Acts. 13:39*

This is to mean as saying that you cannot be justified by law. But if you believe in Jesus, he will redeem you from all sins .

*B) Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law : for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.*  
-Galatians 2:16

In this passage also Paul makes it clear that man cannot be justified by the works of Law. Faith in Jesus is enough for one's own salvation.

*C) For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.*

*But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident ; for, The just shall live by faith.*

*And the law is not of faith : but, the man that doeth them shall live in them.*

*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us : for it is written cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*  
-Galatians. 3:10-13

From the above passage it can be noticed that Paul goes so far as to declare that law is a curse, and affirmed that Jesus was made a curse for us to relieve us from our sins by means of his crucifixion. Even, if the doctrine of cross were to be a truth, Jesus was a blessing having sacrificed his life on cross as ransom for our sins-hence he was a blessing but in no way can be termed as a curse. But Paul affirms him as cursed - an unfair and blasphemous utterance. Elisabeth on seeing Mary, the mother of Jesus commends as here under-

*... Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.*  
-Luke 1:42

One wonders as how Paul contradicted himself throughout in all his epistles. It is not really contradiction, but it can be well pronounced that he played opportunism.

Now examine a passage taken from the epistle written to Romans.

*Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law:*

*Is he the God of Jews only ? is he not also of the Gentiles ? Yes, of the Gentiles also :*

*seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith and uncircumcision through faith.*

*Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid : yea, we establish the law.* -Romans 3:28-31

In this passage he concludes that law cannot be made void, and further says that he established the law. But in the epistle to Galatians, he describes the same law as curse from which they have been redeemed<sup>1</sup>. It is sheer contradiction; nay it is mere opportunism.

### Examine some other passages :

*A) For sin shall not have dominion over you : for ye are not under the law, but under grace; What then ? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace ? God forbid.*  
-Romans 6:14,15

*B) What shall we say then ? Is the law sin ? God forbid. Nay I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.* -Romans 7:7

### Why all this ambiguity ? He (Paul) explains the reason --

*For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.*

*And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law.*

---

1. Galatians 3:10-13

*To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without law.*

*To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak : I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."*  
-I Corinthians 9:19-22

This goes to prove that Paul behaved (pretended) and preached as according to the necessity of then prevailing circumstances. And again when he speaks about the circumcision he makes a stress on the observance of the commandments and diminishes the importance of undergoing outward circumcision.

*Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.* -I Corinthians 7:19

Thus circumcision is excluded from commandments (law). And the more serious point is that when he wanted to liberate people from the observance of the law, he ruled out the law (commandments) by upholding faith -

*But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for the just shall live by faith.*

*And the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them.* -Galatians 3:11-12

NB :- Here the law is excluded from faith. In clearer terms he writes in his epistle to Romans --

*Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.* -Romans 3:28

While God says that one should follow every commandment :

*What thing soever I command you, observe to do it : thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* -Deuteronomy 12:32

Now let us have a glance on the pretence of Paul that how he behaved or rather how he presented himself in different characters before the people of different faiths and practices.

We can see it from his own statement as recorded in the epistle written to Corinthians.

### **please refer I Corinthians. 9:19-22**

A) *And unto the Jews, I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews.*

Basing on the statements of Paul himself one is obliged to believe that he was a born Jew, who persecuted the church. Thus he was well-known for his antichristian activities. Thus he was a staunch Jew. If this be the fact there comes no question of becoming again (or to pretend as) a Jew. And what curious to know is that he gives his reason for the pretence as a Jew saying - "that I might gain the Jews." well, the plan is good. But is it sensible? In his pretence as a Jew, can he preach Jesus? No. But contrariwise he should behave completely as a Jew speaking all nonsense against Jesus. In his disguise of a Jew, if he speak anything in favour of Jesus and his mission, his identity as a Christian can be disclosed and all his efforts become futile. If this be the fact, what was the good that Paul had expected from pretending himself as a Jew?

B) *(I became) "To them that are under the law, as under the law that I might gain them that are under the law."*

This is to mean as saying that Paul pretended as if he was under the law to gain the people of the law. To be like one as under the law to gain those who were under the law, discloses the fact that he was not under the law. But to gain the people of the law, he pretended as if he were also a follower of the law. But a curious question that comes into the minds of readers is that how long one can pretend contrary to his original beliefs and dogmas? And another thing is that he pretended so, to gain them. The general rule is, simply going on pretending contrary to what one has to preach them, what is it that one can expect from his pretence? What is expected cannot be turned into one's favour. Then, inevitably one has to give his message for what his mission is started. In consideration of these facts, as soon as Paul begins to preach his original stand-point, his identity as contrary to his pretence can be disclosed--Thus what all efforts he made might be proved to be of no use.

Let us discuss the second facet of this point. In the passage under discussion, Paul, apart from general group of people, divided the people in whom he preached as three groups in particular. Of them one is the Jews ; second is the people of the law and third is the people without law.

### **I group : Jews**

Believe God, and prophets except Jesus and some other prophets. Follow the law. There were some lapses in following of the law. Jesus was sent to reform them. But they rejected him. They did not accept the reformations, yet they were(are) followers of the law.

### **II group : The people of law**

Who were these people ? They were not Jews, because Paul himself has discriminated them as two separate groups - one, of the Jews and the second, as the people of the law. Who else could have been these people of the law other than Nazarenes the real followers of Jesus' reformed law, under the leadership of Peter ?<sup>1</sup>

### **III group : The people without law**

- > Who were these people ?
- > Were they the Jews, the first group ? No.
- > Were they Nazarenes, the second group ? No.
- > Were they Gentiles ? No.

> This is because wherever he preached in Gentiles, he used to preach directly and openly and invite them towards his church. Here there is no question of pretence. There were men from Gentiles, and Jews, and from Nazarenes too in his church. The arguments made so far, establish the fact that Paul preached contrary to the law. That is to say he preached that-" No flesh can be justified by law but faith in Jesus "<sup>2</sup>. So it was the group of Paul's church(Paulines).

---

1. Matthew 28:19-20

2. Acts 13:39, Galatians 2:16, 3:10-13

Then therefore, Paul pretended in Jews as if he were a Jew and in Nazarenes as if he were a Nazarene.No need of pretence in his own group.

What for all his efforts were ?

### **To gain them :**

This is an unequivocal explanation which prove that Paul had made his irresistible efforts to attract both Jews and Nazarenes towards his church by hook or crook. There is no wrong in inviting Jews as they have not accepted Jesus. But what we would like to pinpoint on the fact is that inviting Nazarenes is a clear evidence to prove that there were two churches and two gospels one under the leadership of Peter and the other of Paul, contradicting each other as we say right from the beginning.

### **PAUL - RINGLEADER OF SECT OF NAZARENES**

*... a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. -Acts 24:5*

*... as concerning this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken against. -Acts 28:22*

We learnt that the followers of Jesus were called Nazarenes. From the above two references it can be well established that a group of people from Nazarenes had been separated and formed as a new group. Such divisions in the religious terminology are known as sects. And Paul was a ringleader(founder) to that sect about which 'everywhere was spoken against'. This discloses the fact that there was a great dissension between the two groups. A dissent group is usually small in number in the early periods. But later it may outstrip the number of its mother religion or may survive in par with it or may disappear ultimately depending on the capabilities of the leaders whether they be benevolent or malevolent. The majority or minority in number is not the criterion to determine the religious or secession sanctity. It can be determined basing on the conformity with the teachings of its original founder or preacher or reformer as is the case may be.

Now let us have a glance over the discrepancies that became the root cause for dissension.

## PAUL PREACHED RESURRECTION OF JESUS - APOSTLES OPPOSED

It is not palatable to the present christians to hear that there were two churches one under apostles of Jesus and the second of Paul a dissent group between whom there was hostility irreconcilable.

*Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen ;And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ : whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised :And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. -I Corinthians 15:12-18*

### IT WAS CHURCH OF PETER THAT DENIED RESURRECTION OF JESUS AS PREACHED BY PAUL

Now let us discuss three verses from the above passage.

*Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you That there is no resurrection of the dead ?*

The above is a verse of two clauses. The first clause is in passive voice while the second is in active voice. Generally in passive voice the information(who does) is not mentioned. So let us change the first clause into active voice. This is just to explain the matter in clearer terms.

Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead... (passive voice)

" now when we preach that Christ rose from the dead." (Active voice)

To whom does the word 'we' the subject of the clause represent to?

According to context "we" represents to Paul and his associates.

This means Paul's church was preaching that when Jesus was put on cross he died and was buried and after three days he was resurrected.

If this be our preaching -

*How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*

In the above clause we find some people rejecting the resurrection. Their rejection was not about the General Resurrection that takes place after the Dooms day(total annihilation of the world) but concerning the resurrection of Jesus as was being preached by Paul.

*how say some among you?*

It may be noted that except in Jerusalem in almost all churches where the number of believers was less, Paul and his disciples directly in person or indirectly by the epistles, preached and caused breaches. Thus in every where there were two groups of believers some in the group of Paul while some others in the group of Peter (Acts 28:22).

Therefore 'how say some among you?' - represents to the group of Peter. So this point most convincingly proves that the early followers of Jesus - Peters church did not believe in the resurrection of Jesus as it did not really happen. To hide this clear picture from the knowledge of present Christians the whole of the context has been linked with the General Resurrection so as to make the present church to think of them as those that do not believe in the General Resurrection only, but not in the resurrection of Jesus. Precautionary measures have also been taken to make believe the present Christians as those that rejected to believe in Jesus' resurrection were not among any of the believers but it was another sect in JEWS by name sudducees<sup>1</sup>. But now let us examine whether they(*how say some among you*) were main group of Nazarenes led by Peter or not.

To know this point, have a glance over the verses 14&18 of the passage.

---

1. Acts 4:1-3 + Acts 23:6-8

A) *And if Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain. (14)*

B) *Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. (18)*

According to verse(14)...your faith is also vain. Whose faith ? of Jews? or of Sadducees ? None of the two. Because they were ones that did not believe in Jesus at all<sup>1</sup>. But here the verse is spoken about the believers in Jesus who were having faith in him.

And according to verse(18) that which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

Thus these two verses disclose the fact that those who rejected to believe in the resurrection of Jesus were the followers of the Peter's church. But not either Jews or Sadducees. Thus it is disclosed that the doctrine of Jesus' resurrection was purely an invention of Paul which was totally rejected by the apostles of Jesus.

### JESUS - SON OR INCARNATE OF GOD ? INCONSISTENCY OR FALLACY ?

Calling God as Father and God addressing his people (creatures) as sons and daughters is no wrong. For example God says particularly about Solomon.

A) *Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about ; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days. He shall build an house for my name ; and he shall be my son and I will be his father and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel for ever.*  
-I Chronicles 22:9-10

B) *And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts : for I have chosen him to be my son and I will be his father.* -I Chronicles 28:6

---

1. Acts 5:17-18

C) *He shall build me an house and I will stablish his throne forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son: ...*  
-I Chronicles 17:12-13

The whole community of Israel is called as son of God : even first born.

A) *And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh thus Saith the Lord. Israel is my son even my firstborn. And I say unto thee let my son go that he may serve me : and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son even thy firstborn.* -Exodus 4:22-23

B) *Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? is not he thy father that hath bought thee ? hath he not made thee and established thee ?* -Deutoronomy 32:6

C) *They shall come with weeping and with supplications will I lead them ; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way wherein they shall not stumble : for I am a father to Israel and Ephraim is my firstborn.* -Jermiah 31:9

Just as Solomon and Israel - the whole community means all Jews are called sons of God and God as their father so also in the same sense it is said of Jesus -

*... therefore also that holy thing [Jesus] which shall be born of thee shall be called the son of God.* -Luke 1:35

### GOD CALLS ANGELS AS HIS SONS

Not only men but also angels are called sons of God :

A) *Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord and Satan came also among them.*  
-Job 1:6

B) *Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord and Satan came also among them to present himself before the Lord.* -Job 2:1

C) *I have said ye are gods, **and all of you are children of the most high.*** -Psalms 82:6

D) *He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt : and the form of the **fourth is like the son of God.*** -Daniel 3:25

Some hasty Pastors apply this clause "Son of God" to Jesus. But one can conclude that it is spoken for the angel. Please refer to Daniel 3:28 as quoted below.

*Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god except their own God.* -Daniel 3:28

And what more funny is some pastors give their oral interpretation that it was not real angel, but son of God (i.e) Jesus, who appeared in the form or in the likeness of an angel.

Israelites(all Jews) call God as Father :

A) *wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, **My father** thou art the guide of my youth ?* -Jeremiah 3:4

B) *But I said, How shall I put thee among the children and give thee a pleasant land a goodly heritage of the hosts of nations ? and I said, **Thou shalt call me My father** : and shalt not turn away from me.* -Jeremiah 3:19

C) ***Have we not all one father?** hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers ?* -Malachi 2:10

D) *... **we have one Father, even God.*** -John 8:41

Just as all people of his time called God as father so also Jesus too called God as his father. The metaphoric meaning of father stands for God the creator; and son for servant(creature). The relation between the

Father and son is no more than the creator and the created(creature). Apart from the above the following passages disclose this fact.

A) *And thou shalt say unto pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, **Israel is my son even my firstborn:** And I say unto thee, **Let my son go,** that he may serve me : and if thou refuse to let him go behold, I will slay thy son, even thy firstborn.* -Exodus 4:22-23

B) *And afterward Moses and Aaron went in and told Pharaoh Thus saith the Lord God of Israel Let my people go that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.*

*And pharaoh said, who is the Lord that I should obey his voice to let Israel go ? I know not the Lord neither will I let Israel go .* -Exodus 5:1-2

C) *Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians and I will rid you out of thier bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm and with great judgments:*

*And I will take you to me for a people and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.* -Exodus 6:6-7

When the above three passages are read together, we understand as follows.

In the passage (A) :- God mentions "Israel is my son."

In the passage (B) :- Moses interprets 'Let my son go' to mean as 'Let my people go'

In the passage (C) :- God himself affirms the meaning of 'My son' to mean as 'My people.'

**God is Father to all people.**

A) *... That ye **may be the children of your Father** which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.*

-Mathew 5:45

B) Be ye therefore perfect **even as your Father** which is in heaven is perfect. -Mathew 5:48

C) Take heed that ye do not your alms before men to be seen of them; otherwise **ye have no reward of your Father** which is in heaven. -Mathew 6:1

D) But thou when thou prayest enter into thy closet and when thou hast shut thy door, **pray to thy Father** which is in secret ; and **thy Father** which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. -Mathew 6:6

### Jesus exhorts the people to pray their Father (Father in the sense of God)

A) After this manner therefore pray ye : **Our Father** which art in heaven... - Mathew 6:9

B) And call no man your Father upon the earth ; **for one is your Father**, which is in heaven. -Mathew 23:9

In support of our argument Jesus further explains in clear terms saying as that God is his father and of the people also ; and at the same time God of the people is God for himself too.

*... I ascend unto my Father and your Father ; and to my God and your God. -John 20:17*

This was the general concept prevailing among the people of that time regarding the relation between creature(of sonship) and the creator(of fatherhood). Accordingly all the disciples and followers as well as Jews who were not believers in Jesus,- used to call God as Father. This custom has been coming right from the first man Adam, **which was the son of God** (Luke 3:38).

contrary to this Paul gave Jesus an extraordinary status, more than what he really deserved for, taking him as a son really born of God and as one that was shed from the loins of God, began to preach the sonship of Jesus.

*Being made so much better than the angels as he hath by Inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.*

*For unto which of the angels said he at any time thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee? And again I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a son ? -Hebrews 1:4-5*

### THE DOCTRINE OF INCARNATION : BY PAUL

Further he preached the doctrine of incarnation :

*And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness : God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world received up into glory. -I Timothy 3:16*

Descent of God in human form is known as incarnation. In this phenomenon God transforms as human being. Now the question is whether God simply assumes human body comprising of all divine characteristics or becomes complete human with only human characteristics deprived of Godly aptitudes.

In this regard please observe the following commentary for the verse (Isaiah 9:6) : from the open Bible :The New King James version published by M/s. Thomas Nelson publishers, New York.

*... Having been born of a woman, Jesus Christ was fully man apart from sin. As a man he experienced the normal physical, mental, social and spiritual growth as others did. He suffered pain, hunger, thirst, fatigue temptation, pleasure and rest. Because of his complete humanity He can be sympathetic and compassionate toward us. While Christ was fully man He was also fully God, as these facts indicate : He is called God(John 1:1)(Hebrew 1:8). He did works that only God could do, such as forgive sins(Mark 2:7) and create(Colossians 1:16) He had attributes that only God could have, such as truth(John 14:6) and omniscience, all knowing(John 2:24,25) and He claimed equality with God (John 10:30)*

From the above commentary Jesus was fully a man with all human weakness. And at the same time he was fully God with all divine powers. He lost none of his divine attributes but became a ManGod or GodMan for ever. It is no less mysterious than of son's coming in the incarnation. Son of God means a son brought forth in existence by giving birth. The transfiguration of God's own person as a human being is incarnation.

Thus if Jesus were incarnate he cannot be son of God. If his person were taken to mean as son of God, he cannot be the incarnate of God.

**Paul further preached :**

*For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*  
-Colossians 2:9

And furthermore he describes Jesus as the image of the invisible God.

*Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.* -Colossians 1:15

If Jesus were the image of the invisible God every man and female is the image of the same invisible God. Because God says -

*And God said let us make man in our image after our likeness...*

*So God created man in his own image in the image of God created he him : male and female created he them.* -Genesis 1:26-27

As God created both male and female in his image, it remains as a point inconceivable whether he resembles as a female or male.

Fact being thus particularly saying Jesus as the image of the invisible God seems to be rather a suggestion to regard Jesus as a visible God because he is the image of the invisible God.

In clearer terms he writes-

Father God says to son God -

*But unto the son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever...*  
-Hebrews 1:8

And again Father God says to son God -

*... Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* -Hebrews 1:9

Thus father retains his Godship over the son.

These are a few from the doctrines that Paul had preached for which the Peter's church was perturbed. Hostility between the church of Peter and the church of Paul reached to rampant. One church tried to suppress the other. One tried to get a rise over other. While one tried to supersede the other. Eventually what became of them, we shall inform in our concluding chapter. But meanwhile we point out some excerpts from the Book of Acts and epistles, which confirm our contention .

**TWO GOSPELS - TWO LEADERS - TWO CHURCHES**

The known fact is that there were two churches with two gospels and two leaders. One was Peter and the other Paul. There had been a great struggle between these two groups ; each trying to surpass the other.

Both of them used to invite the people to believe in their gospels. Both parties tried to carry away the believers of other group to their own group. As a matter of fact Jesus appointed his twelve apostles to propagate and carry out his mission among the mankind with no discrimination such as Jew or Gentile<sup>1</sup>. The mission was being carried on as had been commissioned to them and it was flourishing day by day. All disciples were with one accord and faith, just as only one group as followers of Jesus and preached basing on Jesus' teachings<sup>1</sup>. But when Paul proclaimed himself to be an apostle appointed for Gentiles, he began to preach his own doctrines<sup>2</sup> which were not accepted by the Peter's church<sup>3</sup>. Had they been accepted, as a matter of fact there could have been no hostility nor two gospels as such<sup>4</sup>. Thus two gospels were preached by two leaders.

The group of Peter's church was very strong at Jerusalem as its head quarters<sup>5</sup>. From there they used to spread to all other places and preach the gospel<sup>6</sup>. Thus they could establish their churches in many places abroad. But the number of followers was average. Leaving the Peter's headquarters Jerusalem, in almost of all churches Paul preached his doctrines. Some attracted to the easiest method of attaining kingdom of God(Paradise) as propounded by Paul with mere belief in Jesus as son of

1. Matthew 28:19

4. Acts 28:22

2. II Timothy 2:8 Romans 2:16

5. Acts 21:20

3. Acts 24:5

6. Acts 8:14

God and God's incarnation and that he died on cross for us and rose again from the dead and such like, exempting from the following of law which was preached as a curse<sup>1</sup>. This type of flowery preaching of Paul attracted to many followers and thus he could strengthen his mission in all such places where the number of the group of Peter's church was less. And it does not mean that there were no real followers of Jesus at all. But their number fell to minority except in a few places. knowing these facts when people of Peter's church used to explain them the real teachings of Jesus, many of such people came back to their former belief. Then Paul again used to write letters to such people to attract towards his church by every possible means. Thus the followers fell in dilemma as to which side should one go. All these points can be made clear from the following.

### BRICK BATING OF DEROGATORY WORDING

*Little children, it is the last time : and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists ; whereby we know that it is the last time.*

***They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.***

*-I John. 2:18-19*

The above letter was written by John. Here one should not mistake this John for the apostle John of Christ. This John was one of the chief and founder disciples of Paul's church<sup>2</sup>. From the first verse of the above passage it can be seen that John accuses the people of Peter's party as antichrist. Antichrist means those that work or have faith or preach contrary to the teachings of Christ. Were Peter's party not believers in Christ? Were not they preaching as has been commissioned by Jesus?<sup>3</sup> But where they differed is - they did not give sanction to many of the Pauline doctrines<sup>4</sup> in which preponderance of Jesus as "That Christ" is also included. In our earlier pages 18-21 we have discussed the difference between 'Christ' and 'That Christ'. No doubt that Jesus was a 'Christ', but not "That Christ". The Peter's party rejected to take Jesus as "That Christ". That Christ is a different person about whom Jesus also prophesied. All apostles and disciples of Jesus believed him as a Christ but not as "That

1. Galatians 3:13

2. Galatians 2:9

3. Acts 5:42

4. Roman 15:30-32

Christ". This makes out that there was great dissention between the two groups.

As regards to antichrist, Paul<sup>1</sup> impresses to mean as a particular person that comes in the last days who works against to the preachings of Christ. This is mere meaningless. Every prophet of every time invited the people towards righteousness and godliness. In every prophet's time there existed pro-prophets and anti - prophets(as according to Paul's language antichrist). There is no meaning in coming of a new person as antichrist. Was there no antichrist in the days of Christ? Then who was it that put Jesus on cross? This term of antichrist is the brainchild of Paul. He used such many more devices.

In the second line John explains that

*they went out from us --- but they were not of us : for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they may be made manifest that they were not all of us*  
*-I John. 2:19*

All these things clearly say that they were in his company but later quit it off and joined the company of Peter.

John writes to impress upon his fellow followers(Paul's followers) that those who went out from their party were liars as they denied that Jesus was (That) Christ. And it is the established fact that Peter was the first person to accept Jesus as Christ. And it was revealed to him by God. Jesus appreciated him and promised that he would build his church on Peter<sup>2</sup>. For such a great person's party(church), John brands as antichrist<sup>3</sup> because they strongly objected to Paul's doctrines.

Further John makes it clear that he wrote all these things concerning those that seduce them<sup>4</sup>. Who could be their seducers other than the people of Peter's church ?

*I wrote unto the church : but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them receiveth us not.*

1. Though this letter was written by John it was nothing but the dictation of Paul himself

2. Matthew 16:16-19

3. I John 2:22

4. I John 2:24-26

*Wherefore, if I come I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words : and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church.*

*-III John. 9,10*

From the above it can be seen that some chief associates of Paul's church were not allowed to enter into the church by one Diotrephes. The brethren(followers of Paul) not only were not allowed but also were forbidden to enter into the church. Was it a synagogue of Jews<sup>1</sup> so as to impress one that there was dissension with only Jews ? No. It was the church(group) of Peter's followers. Here one can notice a repulsive resistance rather attack to (Paul's party)by one of the major churches of Peter. In this passage, we find John showing the reason of Diotrephes for not allowing Paul's party as **" he seeks to have preeminence"**. And further he boasts that he would remember his deeds when he would go there. When there was no entrance for him nor for his chief associates and his followers even, what was it that he would see and remember ? He accuses Diotrephes as a one that was seeking pre-eminence by resisting them from entering into the church(of Peter). It is needless to write that he had been one that had already acquired a prominent place in the church of that place who was authorised to attack the group of Paul resisting them who were boycotted by him from entering into the church. These are all articulations made by the present church to keep away the present christians(Paulines) far from perceiving these facts which are being pointed out by us.

This shows how great hostility was there in between the two churches. We leave the choice to readers' discretion to determine that who was antichrist whether Paul or Peter.

---

1. It may be noted that there were no special churches for christians such as these which we see them these days. But both christians (followers of Jesus- Nazarenes) and Jews had common places of worship known as synagogues. But in many places all the members of such synagogues accepted the reformations of Jesus . Hence they became christian dominated of either Peter's church or Paul's or mixed. In some places there were Jews also either as major group or minor (Acts 18:12-20). Just to make our readers understand the arguments in clear terms, we have mentioned here that it was not synagogue, to mean as Peter's dominated synagogue. These churches (Places of worship for christians) came into being only after the Paulines had supplanted the Peter's group.

John writes to his followers - **" Believe not every spirit and try them"**. Men of God are those that believe in incarnation of Jesus<sup>2</sup>. Those that do not believe this - are not of God. From this point it is proved that the Peter's group had no least regard in the incarnation doctrine as propounded by Paul.

Hence John suggests :

*If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your houses nor bid him salutation<sup>3</sup>.*

Jude one of the founder members of Pauline church writes in his general epistle and cautions their party people to be alert and exhorts to contend with those that preach against to their doctrines saying that some people had crept unawares<sup>4</sup>. As regards to them that contradict their doctrines, he writes in derogatory wording - *as brute beasts, clouds they are without water, carried about of winds, trees whose fruit withered, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, raging waves of the sea foaming out their own shame<sup>5</sup>*. These few points disclose the acrimonious behaviour of one party towards the other.

The significant point of this epistle is - *"But these speak evil of those things which they know not"*<sup>6</sup> This is to mean as saying that " They do not know what we preach." And they speak evil of these things means they are not accepting but contradicting. This is a clear evidence that what many of the points that Paul had preached were not known to Peter's church or in other words they were never preached by Jesus christ, such things as these.

To hide out these points and at the same time to impress upon the gospel readers that the apostles and Paul were with one accord and co-operative in the preaching activities but the disputes were only between them and hypocrites but not between apostles and Paul it has been edited and recorded as follows :

*But beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time...* *-Jude 17, 18*

---

1. I John 4:1

4. Jude 3,4

2. I John 4:2-3

5. Jude 11,12,13

3. II John 10

6. Jude 10

## LETTERS OF PETER FORGED

Now let us discuss some excerpts from the General epistle of Peter.

From the following arguments one can understand that this letter was forged as to have been written by Peter.

Nazarenes were divided as two groups one was under the leadership of Peter as Nazarenes and the other was under the leadership of Paul as a sect of the Nazarenes<sup>1</sup>. Generally sects mushroom only when difference of opinion prevails in the doctrines. If all preach with one accord and have faith in conformity with the teachings of the founder there comes no reason as to be divided into different sects.

### NO AMICABLE TERMS BETWEEN PETER AND PAUL

The first thing that we should take into consideration is whether there were amicable terms between Peter and Paul.

A) *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel :*

*Which is not another : but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. -Galatians 1:6-7*

From these two verses we can understand that Paul wrote regarding the people of Galatia that had been carried away from his party. He further explained that the other party people were preaching the same gospel but in perverse way. Hence it is evident that there was difference of opinion in some important doctrines between the two leaders as we say right from the beginning.

" The same gospel with perverse teaching "-clearly means to say that those who were working contrary to the teachings of Paul were neither Jews, nor Sadducees but Paul's counterpart -Peter's party<sup>2</sup>.

Further he writes :

1. Acts 24:5 2. Galatians 2:7 counterpart in the sense as preacher of the same person, Jesus.

*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. - Galatians. 1:8-9*

In these two verses he appeals rather exhorts not to believe any other gospel than that which was given by him. In the earlier verses he admitted that it was not another gospel - but the same gospel with different interpretation. Therefore the "Gospel " of these verses can be taken to mean as "other interpretations." Thus he insists people to believe his interpretations only on the events happened to Jesus.

Here what does 'one gospel with perverse teaching' mean to explain as or in other words how can 'one event' be interpreted in numerous ways - should be made known.

### Example :-

A man was found dead by the road side ----

Passers-by gave their own interpretations (doctrines/teachings) on the event.

### Opinion - Interpretation.

1. He died of heart attack. (a natural death)
2. He committed suicide. (to redeem his family from his own burden)
3. He offered his life. (as a wilful sacrifice)
4. He was assassinated. (on political rivalry)
5. He was assassinated (on religious grounds.)
6. He was killed. (on love affair)
7. He died of an accident. (Accidental)
8. He was killed by robbers, (and robbed off) (Murder)

Now let us come to our point. Paul curses- further he added, those that give the gospel contrary to that of his, though he be a man or an angel from heaven-let him be accursed. Thus he indirectly threatens his people of God's curse if they prefer any other gospel to his own.

### And Paul further says :-

*A) But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.  
-Galatians. 1:11-12*

In these two verses he says that the gospel which he was preaching was not taught by any man but by Jesus himself. Now the question comes- if Jesus was still guiding personally appearing, why did he not appear to the other leader and suggest corrections in his preaching the gospel, as he was none but his own apostle? further Paul describes what he did, immediately after he was made an apostle.

*B)1. [when God called me] To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen :immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood : Neither went I upto Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me ; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. -Galatians. 1:16-17*

*2. But of these who seemed to be somewhat<sup>1</sup>(whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me : God accepteth no man's person;) for they who seemed to be somewhat<sup>1</sup> in conference added nothing to me. -Galatians. 2:6*

From the above two passages we can understand that Paul, ever since he was made an apostle, met none of the apostles nor learnt any thing from them. If they were really co-workers of one divine mission should they have not conferred with each other and sort out programmes as how to work and promote preaching skills ?

C) " Approximately after more than 20 years paul went to Jerusalem.

What for ?

---

1. Apostles of Jesus.

He explains---

He went there to explain to the apostles his gospel which he was preaching among the gentiles (Galatians 2:2).

Does this not mean that Paul preached the doctrines other than that of Peter's ?

*D) For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ring leader of the sect of the Nazarenes. -Acts. 24:5*

This is what is accused(said)about Paul. He is found to be a pestilent fellow. Mover of sedition among all the Jews. Ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes(Acts, 24:5).

From our previous statements, we know that the places of worship and the book of law and main tenets of religion all were one and the same for both Nazarenes and Jews, except some traditional practices which were reformed by Jesus. Therefore they were altogether lived as one community except Jews' calling them as Nazarenes as an identification as the followers of Jesus' reformations. Jews paid no heed to the doctrines such as the resurrection of Jesus and his second coming etc. as propounded by Paul as they had outrightly rejected the person of Jesus himself. But the doctrines such as -

1. God's coming in the form of Jesus (Incarnation)
2. and his person as the begotten son of God and
3. abrogation of law<sup>1</sup> outraged them excessively. Nazarenes rejected all the doctrines of Paul.

Thus Jews and Nazarenes both were dead against to the doctrines as advocated by Paul. This is why it is said of him as a pestilent fellow who was creating disorder (sedition) among all Jews throughout the world. With this accusation it is also said of him as a ringleader to the sect of the Nazarenes. This Joint accusation clearly speaks as we said,

---

1. Acts 18:13-15 + Galatians 3:13

Nazarenes were cooperative with Jews and unitedly lived with harmony. This discloses that if Jews were against to Paul, it cannot be denied that Nazarenes were many times more unfriendly. We know that Peter was the leader for Nazarenes. Then therefore there could be no friendly tendency between Paul and Peter. This is the established fact.

*E) But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest : for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against. -Acts.28:22*

From the above it can be admitted that everywhere it was spoken against to the Paul's sect. This discloses the fact that Paul had caused breaches in all churches(groups of Peter's party). If this be the fact can anybody expect that Peter had been a good friend of Paul ?

### LOGIC RULES OUT RESURRECTION OF JESUS

*F) .... May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest is ? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears....  
-Acts.17:19-20*

Before we discuss on this point, we would like to bring to your remembrance that when Peter and other apostles and disciples were preaching at Jerusalem, the high priest of the council says with Peter as follows :

*And the high priest asked them, saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name ? and behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's<sup>1</sup> blood upon us. -Acts. 5:28*

Now our arguments proceed basing on two important points from the above passage.

- 1) Ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.
- 2) And intend to bring this man's blood upon us.

The first point discloses that the apostles had already spread their doctrine to each and every man. Thus the doctrine which Peter and his church preached, had been well-acquainted to all Jerusalem and thus it was filled with it.

---

1. Jesus' blood.

Now come to the point where Paul under reference Acts.17:19-20 was questioned to explain the new doctrine and about certain strange things which he was preaching. This convincingly proves that there was no relevance between the preachings of Peter and Paul. Because Paul's doctrines appeared to them as new, despite the Peter's doctrines were spread in Jerusalem. So it can be well established that what all Paul had preached were new doctrines and strange things, which had no bearing with the teachings of Peter though both of them preached the same person Jesus. Then can we expect an amicable tendency between Paul and Peter ?

Now let us take up the point No.2

" And intend to bring this man's blood upon us." This is the apprehension of Jews that can be noticed from the above passage.

It is a known fact that Jews had killed many prophets prior to Jesus. In the same manner they became thirsty after the blood of Jesus. They, with some false accusations got the sentence of death penalty by crucifixion imposed upon Jesus, and thus they got rid of him<sup>1</sup>.

Now let us take into consideration the point of apprehension of Jews saying that they(peter's church) were intending to hold them(Jews) responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. Now what we would like to bring to your notice is, that if Peter's church had been preaching the death penalty of Jesus by crucifixion as his wilful sacrifice for the redemption of sins of christians, that act of his sacrifice comes under the Judicial terminology as suicide and hence there is no reason for the apprehension of Jews, as they could not be held responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus.

And the second point as regards to this is that had Peter's church preached the doctrine of Jesus' Resurrection then also there appears no reason for Jews' apprehension. Because if Jesus had really been resurrected from the dead, there remains no dead body in the grave to be exhumed for post-mortem even if F.I R<sup>2</sup> is booked against Jews and on the other hand, it(resurrected body of Jesus) appears in his own living person. This leads to complete acquittal of the case. In this way also there appears no reason for the apprehension of Jews.

---

1. What actually had happened, when Jesus was put on cross, we have discussed in our book-Is Atonement Necessary for Salvation? 2. F.I.R (First Information Record) is essential. Basing on this only prosecution proceeds.

Keeping in view of these two points, if we take the apprehension of Jews into consideration, we can well ascertain that the teachings of Peter's church were quite contrary to the preachings of Paul. Peter never preached the doctrine of wilful sacrifice of Jesus but he and his associates always held Jews as responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus<sup>1</sup>. They proclaimed this fact before all people at all times. This was the reason for the apprehension of Jews which can be disclosed by their saying ***"intend to bring this man's blood upon us"***. Contrary to these facts the letter under his name begins with the doctrine of Jesus' blood on cross and resurrection<sup>2</sup> with which Peter had no concern at all. This is the main reason to say that this letter had been forged, so as to impress upon the present Christians as if it had been written by St. Peter the chief apostle of Jesus, and as if he had also testified the doctrine of blood-sacrifice-death and Resurrection.

And further we find Peter writing as- "....even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given to him hath written unto you."<sup>3</sup> Thus this is a clear certificate by St. Peter to impress upon present Christians as if that St. Peter had also testified all doctrines what all had been preached by Paul. If this letter had not been forged under the name of St. Peter<sup>4</sup> as we say, one must agree that it was written by one of Paul's disciples by name Peter<sup>5</sup>. Then only this letter can be treated as genuine with Pauline doctrines.

## APOSTLES REJECTED PAULINE DOCTRINES

In many places Paul used the word 'TRUTH' in the sense of cross. According to Paul's special terminology it refers to the death of Jesus on it (as ransom for our sins) and his burial and after three days his Resurrection and his bodily Ascension and second coming. All these four points cover in one word 'cross'. Doctrine of sonship and incarnation is also included.

*And their word will eat as doth a canker : of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus ; who concerning the truth have erred saying that the resurrection is past already ; and overthrow the faith of some.*  
-II Timothy 2:17-18

Among those who denied the Resurrection of Jesus and overthrew this faith of some, Hymenaeus and Philetus were two important per-

1. Acts 2:23    2. I Peter 1:2-3    3. II Peter 3:15    4. Galatians 2:7-15  
5. Galatians 2:7-15 (Cepha = Peter ... compare Telugu version)

sons. This speaks very clearly that there were many people who were contradicting the Pauline doctrines. What another noteworthy point is - if they were Jews leave alone the question of Resurrection but they outrightly rejected Jesus. Hence they were not Jews. If they were Gentiles when once they accepted Jesus as preached by Paul there could have been no reason in denying particularly the Resurrection. Either they should have rejected totally or accepted totally as preached by Paul. But they have denied the resurrection of Jesus - this implies to mean that those that have denied the Resurrection of Jesus must have been the people belonging to original apostles of Jesus.

*Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. (For many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ ; whose end is destruction whose God is their belly and whose glory is in their shame who mind earthly things.)* -Philippians 3:17-19

Here also we find Paul warning as that there were many who walk against the cross (meaning Pauline doctrines). And suggests to imitate him (Paul) and his followers alone. This discloses the fact that there were two groups of people in the church of Christ, one following the Pauline doctrines and other denying them. "I have told you often and now tell you even weeping." This clause discloses that how terrible was the adversity that was given to Paul's followers and to his doctrines. Who could have been the rival of Paul other than Peter and his church?

## PAUL PREACHED CROSS - APOSTLES WERE COMMISSIONED TO BAPTIZE : THUS DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN PETER AND PAUL IS CLEAR

*Those things, which ye have both learned, and received and heard, and seen in me, do : and the God of peace shall be with you.*  
-Philippians 4:9

*For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel : not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.*  
-I Corinthians 1:17-18

*For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom : But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness. -I Corinthians 1:22-23*

From the clause of the middle passage - "For Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel [the gospel of cross]" the discrimination between the two groups can easily be made. The first group was of the Apostles whom Jesus christ sent to baptize.

Thus we read : Mathews 28:19

*Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*

Thus the group of apostles was one that was baptizing the people. Paul says in clear terms that he was not of them that were baptizing. Thus he excluded himself from the group of apostles which point rules out any further claim that both Paul and Peter were unitedly preaching and co-workers in the mission of Christ. And further Paul explained the nature of work that was being carried on by him. That is preaching of the cross. This further explains the fact that the group of Peter was not preaching the cross.

### **PAUL PREACHED CROSS - APOSTLES CONTRADICTED**

In the second verse of the middle passage he clearly says that his preaching of cross was foolishness to those that were going to perish. Then who were they that were to be perished and that to whom his preaching of cross appeared to be a foolish act ? He explains in the last passage.

*But we preach christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness."*

We preach Christ crucified may be explained to mean as "we preach the person of Jesus(Christ) who was crucified." But taking into consideration the first verse of the first passage- "lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect" and the second verse "for the preaching of the cross" unequivocally prove that Paul's preaching was more about the cross"( Doctrine of his death on cross as a ransom for our sins - and his Burial and after three days his Resurrection and Ascension and his sec-

ond coming) than of the person of Jesus and his teachings as entrusted to his apostles. Thus it is made clear that the doctrine of cross was a stumbling block to the Jews. They were not orthodox Jews but Nazarenes- the followers of Jesus. For Jews rejected the person of Jesus totally then therefore question of rejecting his cross does not apply to Jews but to Nazarenes only. This point makes it clear that the apostles were dead against to the doctrine of cross as preached by Paul. Hence the confrontation was between Paul and Nazarenes only but not between Paul and Jews.

*For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. -I Corinthians 2:2*

This is one more verse of the same nature as that has passed earlier. In this also Paul says that he had determined not to allow any other doctrine except "Jesus christ and him crucified."

Here we can find one clue to differentiate the teachings of the two groups. The last 'phrase of the verse "Jesus Christ and him crucified" can be replaced to read as "Jesus Christ and his crucifixion". In short "cross of Christ." In clear terms what Paul had determined to say is that he wanted not to know any other thing than the cross of christ among the Corinthians. This goes to prove that some other gospel was also being preached to them contradicting the doctrine of cross.

It may be noted that unless there were(was) some other teachings than the doctrine of cross, Paul would not have been forced to express his determination. If Paul and apostles were preaching one and the same doctrine may it be doctrine of cross or some other the situation would not have been created necessitating Paul to announce that he wanted to see only the doctrine of cross predominant over all other doctrines.

This speaks clearly that the other party was not in favour of the doctrine of cross as was being preached by Paul and his associates.

*For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ yet have ye not many fathers : for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.*

*Wherefore I beseech you be ye followers of me.*

*For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ as I teach everywhere in every church. -I Corinthians 4:15-17*

In the above passage the last clause of the last verse is important which needs a careful examination. It reads as follows :

*Who[Timotheus]shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ as I teach everywhere in every church.*

Whether Paul had established his own churches either in Jews or in Gentiles is not clearly traceable from any source but one thing is certain as we tell repeatedly that he used to keep contact with the churches of christ established by the apostles, either by his person or ambassador or by letters. Thus he penetrated his doctrines almost in all churches of every place. The simple formula of getting oneself redeemed of sins by mere belief in the doctrine of cross absolving oneself with the burden of law as preached by Paul attracted some people of the churches while it was rejected by some others. Thus contradictions - difference of opinion and hostility became prevalent everywhere in the churches. The combat between these two groups was constantly going on. Some times one group was superseded by other while another tried to surpass the other. Thus both tried to surpass each other.

In this letter we find Timotheus having been sent to Corinth as an ambassador from Paul. He would bring into remembrance of all teachings of Paul as were being preached in all other churches everywhere. This points out that other teachings also were going on in the churches. This is why he writes in the beginning of the passage -

*though ye have ten thousand [many] instructors in christ - ye have only one father. I have begotten you. So be ye followers of me.*

Paul wrote to the church in Corinth. It was a church in christ. There were many instructors in christ. Yet Paul had sent his ambassador Timotheus who was entrusted with the responsibility of bringing Corinthians into remembrance of Paul's ways. Ten thousand instructors in christ means many preachers in christ(i.e) group of apostle's church. "Follow ye me" says Paul- meaning you adopt my ways. Then therefore it is

disclosed that his ways were different from the ways of instructors of the church in christ. If both ways were one and the same appealing 'Be ye followers of me' becomes meaningless. And so also the appointment of Timotheus to bring into the remembrance of the ways of Paul becomes ridiculous.

*If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven: whereof I Paul am made a minister. -Colossians 1:23*

The above passage is taken from the letter of Paul written to colossians.

In this, Paul warns his people to be firm and continue in the faith which had been preached by him under his ministry. This is to mean as saying in another form- "Be ye followers of me."

To Corinthians also Paul appeals :

Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.

*Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you. -I Corinthians 11:1-2*

### **CHRIST IS IN ME AND IN YOU TOO, IF YOU ARE NOT REPROBATES - A TRICK OF PAUL TO MAKE SILENCE PEOPLE WHO QUESTIONED HIM**

It is a known fact that Paul began to preach proclaiming that Jesus had appeared in his vision while he was on the way to Damascus and made him an apostle. As according to the necessity he also proclaimed that God was speaking through him and while some other times that Jesus himself was in him. He used suchlike many devices to attract the people towards his church. All these points have been discussed in its appropriate places.

Succumbed to such devices some people believed in his doctrines while some others questioned his authenticity.

*Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me ...*

*-II Corinthians. 13:3*

From above, one can understand that Paul had proclaimed that Jesus was speaking in him. Though some had believed, some others questioned to provide some proof in this regard.

As a reply to them, Paul writes as follows :

*Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith ; prove your  
ownelves. Know ye not your ownelves, how that Jesus Christ is  
in you, except ye be reprobates? -II Corinthians. 13:5*

This is to mean as saying that if you are not reprobates Christ is in you too. Therefore examine yourselves whether you are in faith.

## A PARABLE

The above trick is like the angelic apparels a popular hearsay which goes as follows :

Long long ago there lived a king. One day some strangers with odd appearance came to him. They introduced themselves as the angelic garment makers. Kings generally long to exhibit their pomp. So he ordered some dresses for him. They took the measurements of the king and collected some advance from him and went their way and started weaving.

After two or three days the king went to their industry to examine the work of angelic garments. The weavers welcomed the king and the chief of them took him and showed all his busy people at work on looms. But to the great surprise of the king, people were seen busy in moving their heads - hands, fingers, kneeling down and rising up - peddling the looms with harsh sound while the cloth which was being woven became imperceptible to the king's senses. When he was about to enquire, the chief of them interfered and told the king-

" O great king ! This angelic garment is so blessed and pious as that unless one is conferred with divine blessings, one cannot get the opportunity of wearing these blessed apparels." O King ! "said the man, " you

can assess the virtue of these dresses if the mystery is disclosed." And further said, " these are so pious and virtuous as that can be seen only by a man of chaste birth. No man, O King ! born to an unchaste woman can see with his eyes nor can he touch with his hands. "

As soon as the king heard these words he began to pretend as if he were able to see them and began to appreciate the quality of the cloth and its design etc. with cheerful face. But within himself he began to blame his own birth. He returned to his palace and told the mystery about the angelic garments and how they cannot be seen to a man (or woman) who was born to an unchaste woman. He pretended there also as if he had seen them and boasted that it was incomparably greater than any other cloth, though his conscience was laughing at his guilty pretence.

The birthday celebration of the king was announced. The angelic dress was put on by the king which was the special attraction of the day. To see their king in angelic dress people came from far villages. Everybody saw the king with crown on his head, golden bracelets studded with diamonds at his two wrists; golden ornaments in his neck and precious shoes he wore and sword hung at his left side of his loin, standing in his open chariot followed by his ministers, courtiers and soldiers and sipahis etc. behind. People in rows by the road side and from the balconies of their buildings all saluted the king while the procession moved ahead. Everyone saw the king well decorated with ornaments etc. in his royal pomp. But to their surprise the king was seen only in underwear and Banian with no angelic apparel for which purpose only most of the people came there. Everyone, including his queen and own people saw him naked(not properly dressed) : Yet everyone began to curse one's own birth. Nobody dared to disclose the fact but everybody began to pretend as if the dress were seen by him(her).

One can be deserved to see the angelic dress provided one is of chaste birth. That is the condition in angelic dresses story.

Here, in Paul's explanation when he was questioned to show proof that how Christ was in him speaking -he answered that there was Christ in every believer ; but the condition was that one should have faith and not be reprobate. Poor people were shocked to hear that if one was not reprobate one had Christ in him. Exactly as in the case of angelic dresses

where everyone dreaded to disclose the fact lest his unchaste birth should be made open, so also the people dreaded if they further question Paul about this that they might be regarded as faithless reprobates. Thus everyone was silenced.

### PAUL SAYS - “ WE ARE NOT REPROBATES”

*But I trust that ye shall know that we are not reprobates.  
-II Corinthians. 13:6*

In continuation to the answer for the question to prove that how Christ spoke in him, Paul further writes that they should know that they (Paul and his group) were not reprobates. In his earlier verses he said that Christ was in everyone, if one was not a reprobate. Now in this verse he says that they who questioned him should know that they (Paul and his group) were not reprobates means - as he proclaimed, that Christ was in him really, who spoke in him. This is his affirmation and one aspect of the verse. By this verse, another thing that comes into light is - that the other group (of apostles) had pointed out that Paul and his group as reprobates. For this the second aspect of the verse can be taken to mean as the explanation of Paul saying as that they were not reprobates.

### REPULSIVE ATTACK - TO THE TEACHINGS OF PAUL

*Now I pray to God that ye do no evil : not that we should appear approved, but that ye should do that which is honest, though we be as reprobates.  
-II Corinthians. 13:7*

From the above it can be presumed that the Corinthians were convinced by another group (of apostles) that Paul and his group were reprobates. This fact can be understood by their question to Paul to provide proof regarding his proclamation that Christ was in him who was speaking. As an answer to this he said that Christ was in every one if one was not a reprobate and further said that he (Paul) was not a reprobate meaning what he had proclaimed was an irrefutable fact. If as explained by him that everyone had Christ in one's ownself, if one were not reprobate, then what is it that Christ who was in Paul should say through him alone, when everyone was having Christ in one's ownself, who as a matter of

fact was sufficient to guide oneself ? This is how Paul played his devices<sup>1</sup>. Yet he apprehended some evil from them (Corinthians). So he earnestly appeals in the above verse not to harm them though they seemed to be reprobates. This shows that how great repulsive attack was given to Paul's preachings by Corinthians.

In the above verse we have a key word 'reprobate' (noun) the literal meaning of which is - unruly person, disorderly person, unprincipled person. In view of theological terminology, the word 'reprobates' does not appear to be appropriate in this context. So the verse is verified with Telugu version of New Testament, and found that its usage has been made in the sense of 'heresy' which means belief contrary to the orthodox doctrine ; opinion contrary to what is normally accepted.

Then therefore the last clause of the verse " ..... though we be as reprobates " may be replaced to read as "... though we be as 'heretic'<sup>2</sup>.

Thus it is evident that Paul and his group were termed as heretic. Who else could have called Paul as heretic other than the orthodox apostles ? Does this not make clear that the apostles of Christ did not approve the doctrines as propounded by Paul ?

*For Demas hath forsaken me having loved this present world and is departed unto Thessalonica ... - II Timothy 4:10*

*Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil ; the Lord reward him according to his works : of whom be thou ware also : for he hath greatly withstood our words. - II Timothy 4:14-15*

*At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. -II Timothy 4:16*

*Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me ; that by me the preaching might be fully known and that all the gentiles might hear : And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. -II Timothy 4:17*

---

1. This goes to mean as saying in another way, that except Paul, everyone was/is a faithless reprobate. 2. Heretic (noun) believer in heresy.

The above verses have been taken from the letter of Paul written to Tymotheny, his one of the chief associates. In this he makes mention as how his church was overturned in the early periods. No man listened to Paul and helped but all rejected. Not only this but they all(perhaps) attempted to kill him there. However he managed to escape from their hands which is evident from the words "And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."

*For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life.*

*-II Corinthians. 1:8*

Paul writes to Corinthians that how he and his people were put to troubles when they were in Asia. The words he wrote saying as " we were pressed out of measure, above strength,insomuch that we despaired even of life " speak very clearly that how ferociously Paul and his people were attacked by Asians. This speaks that there also Paul was attempted to be killed.

*And I wrote this same unto you, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice ; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all.*

*-II Corinthians. 2:3*

The above is a clear appeal of Paul to Corinthians to receive him(Paul) with a loving heart. From our foregoing arguments it is learnt that a hostile group was formed there also who questioned Paul to provide a proof for his proclamations. In this letter he indirectly appeals the group of his people at Corinth to see that the hostile group might be controlled so that his joy might be the joy of all of them. Further he writes that he had confidence in them that they could do it.

*Receive us ; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man.*

*-II Corinthians. 7:2*

*For when we were come into Macidonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side ; without were fightings, within were fears.*

*-II Corinthians 7:5*

The first passage shows that how earnestly Paul had requested the people of Corinth, wherein he proclaims that he did no wrong and hence

they ( Paul and his people) might be received. This is a clear indication that shows that there were disputes with corinthians as we discussed above.

The second passage also provides reliable information that how Paul and his people had been miserably attacked by the people of Macidonia.

### **CONTENTIONS AND DIVISIONS WERE DOCTRINAL BASED - AMONG FOLLOWERS OF JESUS - ONE GROUP BY THE SIDE OF APOSTLES WHILE THE OTHER OF PAUL**

*But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.*

*Now in this that I declare unto you I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better but for the worse.*

*For first of all, when ye come together in the church I hear that there be divisions among you ; and I partly believe it.*

*For there must be also heresies among you that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.*

*-I corinthians 11:16-19*

The above passage admits that there were contentions, divisions and difference of opinion on some doctrines(Heresy) among the believers of the church of corinth. In this regard Paul warns the people of his group to avoid exchange of arguments probably with anticipatory doubt lest they might be defeated(*But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom neither the churches of God*).

Divisions can be formed only as an outcome of difference of opinion which is the basis for heresy. Heresy means turning away from the commonly agreed doctrines or having opinion contrary to what is normally agreed.

It is an open secret that when two groups of people with different doctrines exist, one group is heretic to the other group and vice versa.

Paul expresses his anguish in respect of his people among whom he clearly noticed the divisions and heresies. This speaks that there were grave contradictions among the group of the followers of Paul himself. It does not mean that the followers of Paul became two groups but what exactly means to imply is that some of the followers of Paul joined the group of Peter. What the universal truth is that the two contradictory opinions can never agree with each other. And both cannot be taken as fact but only one can be accepted and the other rejected.

*Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you ; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same Judgment.*

*For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you.*

*Now this I say that every one of you Saith I am of Paul ; and I of Apollos ; and I of Cephas ; and I of Christ.*

*Is Christ divided ? was Paul crucified for you ? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul ? -I Corinthians 1:10-13*

From the first verse of the above passage one can understand that Paul had besought the believers of the church of Corinth to be with one accord and one faith without divisions among them. He besought in the name of Jesus the point of which is self evident that they were neither Jews nor Gentiles but believers and followers of Jesus.

The second verse admits that there were contentions among them. One group claimed that it was of Paul, another of Apollos and other of Cephas and some other of Christ. Now the question is that what was the cause for their contentions and divisions. Was it for leadership ? Did one group want to have Paul as their leader ? And the other group Apollos ? No. Not at all. On examination of the verse it becomes clear that there was another group of people who had claimed that they were of Christ. This point very convincingly proves that the disputes and divisions were not for personal leadership. If it were really for leadership there remains no meaning in some group's claiming that they were of Christ. Was there

Christ also as one of the contestors for leadership ? Then what for the divisions and disputes were ?

The last verse provides some information to arrive at, that the contentions and divisions were merely doctrinal based. It can be presumed that those who claimed to be of Christ's group from among the followers of Paul's church were inclining towards Peter's church<sup>1</sup> and this was the reason why they had claimed to be Christ's which point necessitated Paul to entreat them to be undivided. This point further discloses that there was variance between the preachings of Peter and Paul. And the beseeching of Paul to them to be united testify this fact.

Had they really been divided in the names of Paul, Apollos and Cephas, there comes another question "Did they preach different doctrines ?" One must know that Apollos and Cephas were the associates of Paul. They all preached the pauline doctrines only<sup>2</sup>. If this be the fact there seems no reason for some to be called by the name of Apollos and some others by the name of Cephas etc. as if they had preached the doctrines of their own or that they wanted to have their independent followers under their names.

Keeping in view of all these points it can be questioned whether it was a fact of people having been divided under four groups - one under Paul the second under Apollos and the third under Cephas and the fourth under Christ ? No. But under two groups only. This point can be proved from the following passage.

*For ye are yet carnal : for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men ?*

*For while one saith I am of Paul ; and another I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?*

*who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed even as the Lord gave to every man ?"*

*- I Corinthians 3:3-5*

Take note of the verse - "for while one saith I am of Paul and another I am of Apollos ..."

1. Matthew 28:19-20

2. Paul and Apollos were preaching the same doctrines. There was no question of divisions in their names. Paul himself confirms this -" I have planted and Apollos watered..." I Cori 3:6

Here we find only two names - Paul and Apollos are mentioned. This speaks that only two names might have originally been incorporated in the passage I Corinthians(1:10-13) claiming two groups under the names of two only. This point is supported by the following verse.

*And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes.. -I Corinthians 4:6*

### **To myself and to Apollos :**

Being Apollos his associate there is no question of contradicting the Paul's doctrines<sup>1</sup>. But here the discussion is going on, on the point of divisions. Here one must know that only Peter and his church were contradicting Pauline doctrines. This point has been established from our arguments made so far. And then therefore in the place of Apollos the name of Peter might have been originally incorporated. Then the verse can be reproduced to read as -

" For while one saith I am of Paul and another I am of Peter. " Who then is Paul and who is Peter but ministers in whom ye believed even as the Lord gave to every man? It proves the enmity between two groups.

### **FOLLOWING PASSAGES SHOW - PAUL WANTED TO AVOID OTHER GROUP**

*Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.*

*For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." -Roman 16:17-18*

In this passage Paul earnestly asks his followers to mark and avoid them who cause division contrary to the doctrine which they had learnt(from Paul). Those that were contradicting his doctrines were no other than the Peter's church. They were not Jews but Nazarenes (Peter's church). Jews outrightly rejected Jesus and hence there is no question of contradicting the mere doctrines. The second verse makes this point clear.

---

1. I [Paul] have planted - Apollos watered ... -I Corinthians 3:6

*For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ but their own belly by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.*

This is to mean as saying that those who caused division and contradicted the Pauline doctrine were not sincere followers of Christ(**serve not our Lord Christ**) but in his name they were deceiving the simple by their good words and fair speeches merely for their belly's sake(vested interest). Whether they were sincere workers or not is not the question - but they were preachers in the name of Jesus with good words and fair speeches. This point proves that they were no other than Peter's church and Paul wanted that they should be avoided by his church.

*O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you? -Galatians 3:1*

From the above passage it is evident that Paul wrote to Galatians that Jesus Christ was put on cross before their eyes and among them. Now what our question is was Jesus really crucified among Galatians at Galatia or were they accidentally present at Jerusalem before whose eyes " *Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified.*" *Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified* - where was Jesus really put on cross ? was it Jerusalem or Galatia ?

This letter appears to have been written when many of the Galatians had rejected the Pauline doctrines. The Passage begins with chiding them..."O foolish Galatians " and its successive clause - '*Who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth*' makes it clear that when the message of Pauline doctrines was put before them or after their acceptance some might have entered and disturbed them. This point is evident from this clause. In the further clause, '*truth*' is explained as the doctrine of cross. Those that contradicted the doctrine of 'cross' were not Jews, because leave alone the question of rejecting the doctrines, but they had rejected the person of Jesus himself. Then therefore who else could have been the contradictors of Pauline doctrines other than the church of Peter?

*That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive ;*

*-Ephesians 4:14*

This passage also speaks about the two churches(groups) one trying to attract the people towards one's own church(group) while another trying to prevent one's own group from being carried away by the other. The clause " *that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro*", clearly shows that the people of the two churches were not firm in any one of the two churches but often tossed from one to another. So to keep his church(group) firm in his side Paul writes to Ephesians that they should not be carried about with every wind of doctrine. And the phrase "every wind of doctrine" is another evidence to prove that there was no relevance between the doctrines thus preached by the two churches. Paul expresses his fear by cautioning his people to be careful lest they might be carried away by the other church(group)- by words such as "cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

*And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel.*

*for which I am an ambassador in bonds : that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.*

*But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things :*

*Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.*

*-Ephesians 6:19-22*

The last two verses of the above passage confirm our point as mentioned in the former passage(Ephesians 4:14) that Paul had written to Ephesians showing his fear lest they might be carried away. Further in these two verses we find Paul having appointed his deputy by name Tychicus at Ephesus so as to watch over his church and see that they might be strict followers of his own church not being scattered.

*To Titus, mine own son after the common faith : grace, mercy and peace, from God the father and the Lord Jesus christ our saviour.*

*For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee :*

(Some qualities of the elders are stated in verses. 6,7,8 : and now the main quality as required by Paul is mentioned below)

*Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.*

*For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision : whose mouths must be stopped , who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.*

*One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts slow bellies.*

*This witness is true, wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith :*

*Not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." -Titus 1:4-14*

This passage is taken from the letter by Paul to Titus. " *To Titus mine own son after the common faith* " speaks that Titus was one of the chief associates of Paul. He was left(appointed) at Crete so as that he should look after the things that were wanting in establishing the Pauline doctrines. Paul suggested him to appoint elders with some qualities as made mention in verses 6,7,8. But the real qualification what Paul had expected of the person who was to be appointed should be of ...

*Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers (1:9)*

The above verse means as saying that he should be faithful to Pauline doctrines. He should be able to explain and propagate them and at the same time he must be able to convince (by any means) them who contradict (gainsayers) the doctrines.

Who were they that were contradicting his doctrines ?

*" For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers..."*

Paul described them as unruly (undisciplined) vain talkers and deceivers.

Deceivers : To whom were they deceiving ?

Vain talkers : Were they really useless talkers ?

The second clause of the same verse explains to the above questions as - *" They subvert whole houses teaching things..."*

That is to say that they were teaching and many families were being attracted to the teachings. These were the things that unruly - vain talkers and deceivers were doing.

*"Their mouths must be stopped..."*

If they were really disorderly (unruly) babblers and deceivers and if Paul were really courteous and compassionate towards them he should have rather suggested Titus to see that they might be set right and made well - disciplined and hindered from deceiving. But it is curious to note that Paul wanted their mouths to be stopped means their teaching must be stopped.

Were they Jews or Gentiles who were working against Paul and contradicting his doctrines?

*" Specially they are of circumcision..."*

Paul explains here that they were the people of circumcision.

From the following we can understand who were they that of circumcision.

*But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter. -Galatians 2:7*

From the above passage it is made clear that it was Peter and his group who had been appointed to preach among the people of circumcision. Then therefore the warning of Paul to his people to see that the mouths of those *" Who are specially of circumcision"* must be stopped, discloses that Paul wanted that the preaching of Peter who had been appointed to preach among circumcision must be stopped.

The above points disclose the fact that Paul had appointed his deputies in almost all places where the churches of Peter were preaching the gospel. Paul suggested his people to give a strong attack to Peter's churches and to see that their mouths might be stopped by any means.

*And the servant of the Lord must not strive : but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth: And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil who are taken captive by him at his will. - II Timothy 2:24-26*

This passage is taken from the letter written to Timothy. In this, Paul instructs him not to enter into arguments (*And the servant of the Lord must not strive*). The literal meaning of the word 'strive' is to try hard. He appointed him there only for the purpose of striving. Yet Paul instructed him not to strive. Therefore taking into consideration the context the word strive may be taken to mean as "not to enter into arguments". Because Paul knew that the doctrines he propounded do not stand to the test of reason<sup>1</sup>. Thus arguments may result in adverse effects. But he advised him to instruct them with patience in meekness and in gentle way with a fond hope that those who rejected him might come back again (*And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil who are taken captive by him at his will*).

*Wherefore when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone :*

---

1. This fact can be well established from our arguments made so far.

*And sent Timotheus, our brother, and minister of God, and our fellowlabourer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith;*

*That no man should be moved by these afflictions ; for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto.*

*For verily, when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation; even as it came to pass, and ye know.*

*For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you and our labour be in vain.*

*But now when Timotheus came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly to see us, as we also to see you : Therefore, brethren, we were comforted over you in all our affliction and distress by your faith. -I Thessalonians 3:1-8*

The above passage is taken from the epistle written to Thessalonians. It was written from Athens. Most probably from there Paul had an idea of going to Thessalonica.

*But we, brethren, being taken from you for a short time in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire. Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again, but satan hindered us.*

*-I Thessalonians 2:17-18*

Paul writes in II Timothy the reason for the hindrance caused by satan.

*For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica ; ...*

*Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil... of whom be thou ware also, for he hath greatly withstood our words. At my first answer no man stood with me ; but all men forsook me ... Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me and strengthened me; that by me*

*the preaching might be fully known and that all the Gentiles might hear ; And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."*

*-II Timothy 4:10-17*

From the above it can be established that there<sup>1</sup> was a horrible confrontation to the church of Paul. The important point to be taken into consideration in sending Timothy to Thessalonica is, that Demas who was his associate forsook him and went to Thessalonica. And Paul predicted a dread from Demas lest he might by any means disturb the church at Thessalonica. So he sent Timothy to counteract the devices, if any played by Demas so as that no man should be moved from the faith as preached by him (Paul). After assessing the situation there Timothy came back to Paul with good news about their faith. Expressing his joy, Paul wrote this letter to Thessalonians. All these points as discussed can be noticed from the foregoing passage Thessalonians 3:1-8.

*Now we command you, brethren , in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.*

*- II Thessalonians 3:6*

In this verse also Paul warns his people to keep themselves away from the people who walk not after the tradition as preached by him. In this way cautioning his people is not a crime but most commendable. But what we primarily point out from this is - that from whose company he wanted to separate his people, were NOT JEWS NOR HEATHENS but his own people who once had accepted his doctrines but later discarded. This point can be clearly seen from "... (walketh) not after the tradition which he received of us."

*And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.*

*-II Thessalonians 3:14*

This verse is another proof to say that those who rejected his doctrines were no other than the believers of the same church. Were they Jews or any other than the believers in Jesus, could ever Paul have ordered saying - " *And if any man obey not our word by this epistle* " - and further "*note that man and have no company with him ?*"

---

1. The place is not ascertainable but predictable as Athens.

**CONSECUTIVE PASSAGES SHOW THAT PAUL PREACHED AMONG GROUP OF PETER- SOME ATTRACTED TO HIS TEACHINGS -BUT LATER QUIT HIM AND JOINED AGAIN PETER'S GROUP**

1. *Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.*
2. *And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected ; but received me as an angel of God even as Christ Jesus.*
3. *Where is then the blessedness ye spake of ? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes and have given them to me.*
4. *Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?*
5. *They zealously affect you, but not well ; yea, they would exclude you that ye might affect them.*
6. *But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing and not only when I am present with you.*
7. *My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you.*
8. *I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice ; for I stand in doubt of you. - Galatians 4:13-20*

The first verse(1) of the above passage speaks that Paul had preached the Galatians even in his physical weakness. He reminds it here.

Whom did he preach ? To Gentiles ? or to Jews ? No. But he preached to the followers of Jesus. They had been believers in Jesus even before they had been preached by Paul- means they were the followers of Peter's church. The second verse(2) makes it clear- "*Ye despised not nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.*" Who could they have been other than believers in Jesus themselves who received Paul in his first time with so much respect and reverence as Christ Jesus himself? Receiving Paul at the first time even as Christ Jesus himself is self

explanatory that they had been believers in Jesus and members of Peter's church whom Paul preached his doctrines. And they were very affectionate towards Paul which point we can know from the third verse(3)- "*[[Paul] bear you record that if it had been possible you would have plucked out your eyes and have given them to me.*" And the fourth verse(4) speaks that they despised and rejected Paul - "*Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth ?*"

Here the word 'TRUTH' is not the antonym of falsehood but refers to Pauline doctrine<sup>1</sup>.

**Points to be remembered -**

1. Galatians were the believers in Jesus and the members of Peter's church.
2. Paul went to them and preached his doctrines.
3. Firstly they accepted and received Paul and his doctrines.
4. Later they despised and rejected Paul and his doctrines.

Galatians received Paul as cordially as even Christ Jesus at his first visit and accepted his doctrines also. But later(when they were set right and rechecked) they had rejected. After their having been rechecked they had rejected both Paul and his doctrines- is a clear evidence to prove that there had been a great variance between preachings and doctrines of Peter and Paul. The gulf of variance between the two doctrines can be well imagined from the points that they were affectionate and reverential friends who later became enemies. The following passages make clear all these points.

**A.** *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth<sup>1</sup> before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? -Galatians 3:1*

**B.** *Ye did run well ; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth<sup>1</sup>?*

*This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you.*

---

1. II Timothy 2:18

*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.*

*I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded : but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.*

*And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision why do I yet suffer persecution ? then is the offence of the cross ceased.*

*I would they were even cut off which trouble you.*

*-Galatians 5:7-12*

The last two verses of the above passage provide an adequate interpretation of the word 'circumcision' - Many times we have come across with this word in our previous arguments some times in literal sense and some times figuratively for Law.

*" If I yet preach circumcision <sup>1</sup> ... "*

It is a known fact that the word 'circumcision' does not stand for the particular act of 'circumcision' but used in the sense of law according to present context. So the verse reads as ( ... if I yet preach law ...). This means as saying that Paul not only, not preaching the law but preaching against to it. ( *Then is the offence of the cross ceased*)

On the other hand he was preaching the doctrine of cross the easiest method of getting redemption from one's own sins.

Thus the two dialectic acts of Paul became the cause for all persecution that he was suffering (*offence of the cross*) - This means that the doctrine of cross was termed as an offence. It is needless to mention that the law preachers in the name of Jesus were apostles and their group(Nazarenes). Thus they regarded the doctrine of cross preached by Paul as an offence. These points can be well established by the last verse "*I would they were even cut off which trouble you.*"

*C. Let no man deceive you with vain words ; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.*

*Be not ye therefore partakers with them.*

---

1.For the clarification of the words - "circumcision" and "law" as together refer to law, please see Acts 21:20-24. Circumcision is a rite of cutting of the flesh of foreskin, which act is, as a matter of fact corollary to the law. So according to particular context, it can be taken to mean for law.

*For ye were some times darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light:*

*(For the fruit of the spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth ;)*

*Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness but rather reprove them.*

*-Ephesians 5:6-11*

Keeping in mind the arguments made so far it can be noticed from the above passage that Paul advises the Ephesians not to be deceived of the vain words. In view of Paul whose were the vain words other than that of Peter's church ? further he threatens them with the wrath of God if they would obey them. And hence advises them to have no fellowship with them but(if possible) to reprove them.

## **REAL PERSONS OF THE RIVAL PARTY OF PAUL**

From the following arguments one can very easily identify the rival party of Paul about whom he most often warned his church to be careful of. As regarding these, we find in epistles written by Paul to have been mentioned as Jews and some times as false apostles and some other times as hypocrites. Whose party was on christbased preachings? Who were correct teachers ? who were perverting the real teachings of christ? - are not the points dealt with in this chapter. This exclusively deals with points related in bringing out the facts that show the correct picture as regards to the rivalry whether it was between Jews and christians or between Paul and Jews or between real followers and hypocrites or between false apostles and real apostles.

## **RIVALS WERE NOT JEWS - BUT PETER'S CHURCH**

*A) For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision. Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. -Titus 1:10-11*

The significant hint as made mention about those that deny and contradict is -

*" Specially they of the circumcision - "*

They were not Jews - but Jews who believed Jesus' reformatations and were strict adherents of Mosaic law and hence they were Nazarenes belonging to Peter's church. They were described as deceivers and contradictors of the sound doctrine( Pauline doctrines). If they were really Jews there was no question of denying or contradicting the doctrines as they had totally rejected the person of Jesus himself.

And another thing is that Peter was(according to Paul) an apostle for circumcised ones<sup>1</sup>. Therefore the clue 'specially they of the circumcision' most aptly applicable to the people of Peter's church. Then therefore those that denied and contradicted Paul were no other than Peter and his church.

Further Paul instructed Titus to see that their mouths must be stopped meaning they should be subverted by any means. To get this done successfully by taking the support of Cretians he instigated them in his letter to rage against the people of Peter by imputing one of his prophets (apostles) to have said that Cretians were always liars, evil beasts and slow bellies<sup>2</sup>.

B) In the sight of Paul those people that do not believe his doctrines are heretic.

Hence he suggested one of his main associates to reject such ones.

*A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject. -Titus 3:10*

This makes clear that there were people who did not believe in the doctrines which were being propagated by Paul and his associates, among the followers of Jesus themselves.

*C) Unto Timothy my own son in the faith ... -I Timothy 1:2*

This speaks that Timothy was also one of the chief founder associates of Pauline church(Paul).

---

1. Galatians 2:7

2. Titus 1:12

*As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine. - I Timothy 1:3*

In this letter Paul exhorts Timothy to charge some that they should not teach any other doctrine than that of his own.

*... and of faith unfeigned from which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling. - I Timothy 1:5-6*

*Of faith unfeigned* - means as saying that one must have faith with no pretence.

From which some have turned away meaning when they were in our group they were pretending as though they were with us ; but now they have changed their direction to vain jangling.

What is that vain Jangling according to Paul ? It is explained in its successive verse.

*Desiring to be teachers of the law .... -Timothy 1:7*

### **Who were the teachers of law ?**

In our previous pages we have discussed that how strict Jesus had been regarding the law. He used to chide the Jews who were partial in observing the law. They used to follow the easiest parts of it and neglected the heavier matters. Not only this but also they used to misinterpret it and at the same time they used to give more preference to the traditions (inventions) of their fathers rather than observing the law. As a matter of fact Jesus was sent to reform them. And hence his mission was to re-establish the law in its perspective form. Then therefore the teachers of law were the group of apostles under the leadership of Peter (Mathew 28:19-20).

To which direction had they turned ? They turned to the direction to become the teachers of law : meaning they had joined the company of Peter's church.

## NO CONCORDANCE IN THE TEACHINGS OF APOSTLES AND OF PAUL

*D) Am I not an apostle ? am I not free ? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord ? Are not ye my work in the Lord? If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you : for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." -I Corinthians 9:1-2*

The above is a passage taken from epistle of Paul to Corinthians. The questions he posed in the first verse of the above, disclose the fact that some people had denied his apostleship and questioned the authenticity of his claim of having seen Jesus. The first clause of the second verse - "If I be not an apostle to others" evidently stands in support of our contention. And again its second clause - "Yet doubtless I am to you (an apostle) : for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord" is a clear testimony saying that though "I be not an apostle for other group yet I am indeed to you. You are ones that have accepted me as an apostle." Thus it is disclosed that there were two groups of people in the church of Christ one belonging to Peter's and other of Paul. Here one must notice that the claims of apostleship were not for leadership over the church and to get personal prominence, but purely to acquire doctrinal predominance as propounded by each. One is dogmatic over other in establishing one's own doctrines. This is a clear proof that there was no concordance between the two doctrines. Thus two doctrines are obvious one preached by Peter and the other by Paul.

*E) For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.*

*But by the grace of God I am what I am : and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain : but I laboured more abundantly than they all : yet not I but the grace of God which was with me. -I Corinthians 15:9-10*

Here Paul writes that he was the least of all the apostles and further says that he was not deserved to be called as an apostle for having persecuted the church. Yet admits that he was what he had been conferred with : and had laboured more abundantly than all other apostles. As a matter of fact he never met any apostle until after twenty years after

---

1. Galatians 1:15-20 + 2:1

he was made an apostle<sup>1</sup>. Fact being thus it surprises one as to how he claims that he had laboured more abundantly than the all other apostles. What we mean to say here is that he might have worked abundantly but in no way can make a comparison with the work of the apostles as he had never met apostles ever since he was made an apostle until he was caught by those that attacked to kill him. And another thing is that the words such as "I laboured more abundantly than they all" focus more on the disharmony they had between them, than on the point of assessment of the work as to who did more.

*F) Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of men after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ. -Colossians 2:8*

From the above, a warning and caution by Paul to his people can be seen. In it he expresses his fear lest any man should be carried away by another group by the attraction of philosophy and deceitful traditions of men which were worldly rudiments only but not after Christ.

In this verse Paul describes

1. Philosophy 2. Traditions 3. Rudiments- as vain worldly things which are not after Christ, and hence warns his people not to go after such people as -

1. Seek truth and knowledge of ultimate truth and reality (ie) God (Philosophy).
2. (Walk after) the element principles of the subject - here according to context subject stands for religion (Rudiments).
3. (Walk according to) belief handed down to posterity (Tradition).

Now let us find out whether these three are vain worldly things which are not after Christ as explained by Paul or the important tenets which one should follow for one's own salvation according to Jesus.

*Philosophy* : As regards to this, when a scribe having heard the answer by Jesus for his question, says as follows -

*A) And the scribe said unto him, well, Master, thou hast said the truth : for there is one God : and there is none other but he. - Mark 12:32*

*And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him,  
Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. -Mark 12:34*

Jesus says in an another place-

*B) But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ,  
and all ye are brethren. -Matthew 23:8*

*And call no man your father upon the earth : for one is your Father  
which is in heaven. -Matthew 23:9*

The above two passages under A&B unequivocally prove that God is only ONE BEING beside whom there is no other God and that He does not manifest in the human form. And according to Jesus this is the Philosophy that one should know. It contradicts to the belief of Jesus' incarnation as propounded by Paul. Hence he wanted to keep his group from knowing the real philosophy. And hence advised them to be careful of those teachers.

Paul says that God Himself had manifested in the human incarnation on the earth:

*For in him [Jesus] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily  
- Colossians 2:9*

Jesus had appointed his apostles to preach all that what he had taught to them (Matthew 28:19-20) and accordingly they might be preaching from whose Philosophy that Paul wanted his people to be saved (Colossians 2:8).

In view of the above points, whose philosophy is vain and worldly and not after christ- whether of Paul's or his rival party's, from whom he cautioned his people to be careful of - is left for the discretion of our readers.

#### **Rudiments - Traditions**

We cannot differentiate these two words though they carry the different meanings - because, traditions stand for the following of rudiments only which have been given in succession as traditions, by prophets.

As regards to rudiments (Element principles of the religion) Jesus says -

*Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. -Matthew 5:17-18*

As regards to the Traditions (belief handed down) Jesus commands to his disciples - (Tradition of prophets but not of men)

*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the son, and of the Holy Ghost, **teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you...**  
-Matthew 28: 19-20*

Contrary to these fundamental points, Paul preaches that these are vain worldly things from which one must be far away.

*G) Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of an holyday or of the newmoon or of the Sabbath days ... Let no man beguile you.... -Colossians 2:16-18*

In this passage also we see Paul cautioning his people lest they should be beguiled. Here he provides some hint as regards to those that tempt to his people as they were those that follow the law. Who were they that were meticulous observers of law other than Peter's party ?

*H) Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife : and some also of good will : The one preach Christ of contention not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds ;*

*But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel.*

*What then ? notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth Christ is preached : and I therein do rejoice yea and will rejoice. -Philippians 1:15-18*

In the above passage one can see two groups of people preaching in two ways. Of them one was contradicting Paul- "*not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds*"

and the other supporting Paul - "*But the other of love knowing that I am set for defence of the gospel.*"

Here it is made clear by Paul that both groups were preaching and it was revolving on the pivot of Jesus. As regards to this Paul expresses also his joy".... *Christ is preached ; and I therein do rejoice...*"

Right from the beginning it is being explained that there were two groups of preachers under two leaderships. And there was great dissension between the two groups. To hide out these points so as not to be perceived of present Christians, the present Church has taken every possible precaution in editing the context to mean the rival party as Jews or some others wherever necessary.

But the above passage provides a good hint to prove that they were not Jews that had rivalry with Paul's group but they were the followers of Jesus themselves. Because they were preaching Jesus Christ. Can Jews ever preach Jesus as Christ? And who could else have been the preachers of Jesus contrary to the teachings of Paul other than Peter's church?

### APOSTLES - DOGS AND EVIL WORKERS ?

*I) Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous but for you it is safe.*

*Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers beware of the CONCISION.*

*For we are the circumcision ; which worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh.*

*-Philippians 3:1-3*

Paul cautions his people that they should be careful- "*Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the CONCISION.*"

The word 'CONCISION' represents to mean as circumcision according to the context. However when one makes a comparison with the Urdu and Telugu versions<sup>1</sup> one cannot miss to find the words "whoso observe the cutting" instead of CONCISION as made mention in English version.

What is meant by cutting ? cutting of the flesh. That is circumcision. This view is most apt to the context also. Then the verse can be reproduced to read as - 'Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the circumcised ones (circumcision preachers). Who were they that had

1. "CONCISION" - one can see its meaning as circumcision in "A Bible word list", which provides the list of words which are no longer in everyday use.

been observing the circumcision? A hasty christian may say - 'Jews'. Well - we ask him, can Jews preach Jesus? They were followers of Jesus, Nazarenes whose chief apostle was Peter(Phillipians 1:15-18). To them Paul says "Dogs and evil workers." This shows the depth of difference in the nature of works they both had undertaken and the difference of opinion and the rivalry they had against each other.

### APOSTLES - SATAN ?

*J) But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.*

*For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or*

*if ye receive another spirit which ye have not received or another gospel which ye have not accepted, Ye might well bear with him.*

*For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.*

*-II Corinthians 11:3-5*

In this passage also Paul cautions his followers. It is taken from his letter to Corinthians. He expresses his doubt that lest they should be carried away by the other group. Passage explains that some from the group of Peter(apostle) might have been to Corinth to preach them the gospel of Jesus. By that time Paul was not present at Corinth. It can be predicted from the passage that knowing that some from the group of Peter had gone there or even before, with mere speculation that the other group might enter there, as a fore warning Paul wrote this letter. Peter's group was also constantly preaching the gospel and established his(Peter's) churches(groups of followers). And in their(apostles) absence Paul used to enter either by his person or through his letters (epistles) he used to preach his gospel. This passage is best example to prove this point.

*For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we have not preached ...* means

If he that comes preaches other doctrine than what we have preached regarding Jesus *in other words--*

We have preached certain doctrines regarding Jesus- If he that comes preaches any other doctrine regarding Jesus than one we have preached.

The noteworthy point from above is - The one that preaches Jesus cannot be either a Jew or Gentile but must be from the apostles only. There were only two churches - one of Paul's and the other of Peter's.

The sum and substance of the passage is that Paul expressed his fear that they(Corinthians) might by any means be tempted to the other doctrine than one that he had preached to them. Here he compared the one that would preach the other doctrine(gospel) with serpent(satan) who beguiled Eve through his subtlety. This point discloses how restlessly the other party was preaching their doctrine contradicting the Paul's ; and that how terribly regardless that Paul had been towards the apostles of Jesus. This point can be well established by the following verse also.

Paul says in the same passage -

*For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.  
II Corinthians 11:5*

Some other passages also speak how great disparity and disharmony was there between two churches.

*1) I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak.  
Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold(I speak foolishly) I am bold also.*

*Are they Hebrews ? So am I. Are they Israelites ? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham ? So am I.*

*Are they ministers of Christ ?(I speak as a fool) I am more...  
-II Corinthians 11:21-23*

*2) I am become a fool in glorifying : Ye have compelled me; for I ought to have been commended of you : for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles though I be nothing.  
-II Corinthians 12:11*

*3) Do ye look on things after the outward appearance ? If any man trust to himself that he is christ's let him of himself think this again, that, as he is christ's, even so are we Christ's.  
-II Corinthians 10:7*

## **HISTORY OF PAUL IN A NUTSHELL - TWO FACETS OF COIN PROVIDE RECORDS OF IRRELEVANT EVENTS**

Paul first appears as a young man. People stones Stephen to death. Witnesses lay their dresses at his feet. And he consents to his death<sup>1</sup>.

There was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem and hence all followers of Jesus except the apostles were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria<sup>2</sup>. And as for Saul(Paul), he caused great destruction of the church<sup>3</sup> entering into every house and dragging out men and women and imprisoned them. He took letters from the high priest to the Synagogues at Damascus enabling him to bring the people of faith in Jesus, bound back to Jerusalem, so as to imprison them too.<sup>4</sup>

Now the question is what became of the rulers - and law and order at Jerusalem ? Stoning of Stephen to death in public, great devastation at Jerusalem, and notwithstanding to the Persecution, many people belonging to one faith fled to other places. Some were imprisoned. It appears as though the high Priest and the Jews became all powerful to take the law into their own hands. In consideration of these points, remember the fact that just to kill one man- Jesus, the Jews after passing through so many attempts and failures at last accused him to be a traitor by forwarding false witnesses. Then only they got the sentence of crucifixion decreed against him by the rulers. Contrary to these facts the stoning of Stephen to death and havoc created by Saul(Paul) and imprisonments - all seem to be a fable invented just to impress upon the latter Christians to think of repentant Saul(Paul) as one that had been divinely guided. This is exactly what the further verses mean to explain as---

*And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus, and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. -Acts 9:3*

In vision, Jesus appears to Saul(Paul) and makes him his apostle. Acts 9:3-19

In support to the above event --

---

1. Acts 7:58      2. Acts 8:1      3. Church here means a group of followers of Jesus but not a building as a place of worship-      4. Acts 9:1-2

We find a passage in the letter of Paul written to impress the then innocent Galatians that how the churches at Judea had reacted merely when they heard that a persecutor of their religion was preaching the same religion.

Thus we read from the following

*Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; And was unknown by face unto the Churches of Judea which were in Christ: But they had heard only, **That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed.** And they glorified God in me. -Galatians 1:21-24*

This is to mean as saying - " O foolish Galatians why have you gone back from my church, while the churches at Judea have believed even without seeing me ? "

Paul had used such devices as according to the necessity to strengthen his church and to get an upper hand over the Peter's. The present church being the Paul's, regards all such devices as divine inspirations.

Thus the fables as made popular about Paul not only attracted the then people but also to the present people to a greater extent.

This is all about how he became an additional apostle for the church of Christ.

After he was made apostle, he began to preach in the Synagogues. He stayed with disciples at Damascus. He preached enormously to such an extent as the Jews planned to kill him. However the disciples could manage to save him by night by letting him down by the wall in a basket (Acts 9:19-25).

The above incident gives rise to think that the disciples at Damascus were idle and were not preaching the Gospel; could they really remain not preaching ? Further it infers to mean as Saul (Paul) alone had preached there boldly. And most probably this was the reason why the Jews of that place tried to kill him, leaving all other disciples.

Further point that must be taken into consideration is the incidents such as these do not take effect all at overnight. But pass through a lingering process. Now what surprising is, should this news had not been conveyed to the apostles at Jerusalem ? Could this great venture of Paul had ever been kept hidden from the notice of apostles at Jerusalem ? However after having been saved from the strategy of Jews to put an end to, at Damascus, Paul reached to Jerusalem to meet the apostles. But they were all afraid of him and believed not that he was a disciple<sup>1</sup>. However this attitude of the apostles might have hurt the feelings of Paul.

It is in between ourselves : The one disciple at Damascus by name Ananias in his vision, was informed by Jesus to go to Paul to inform him what he had to do about one whom he had seen in his vision, and to baptize him, saying that he (Paul) was -- "*a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before Gentiles and the Kings, and the children of Israel*".

In the same manner Jesus ought to have informed the apostles at Jerusalem that such and such a young man would be coming to whom he had made an additional apostle, even before he (Paul) was put to shame by their attitude not believing him as a disciple. What a striking point is that Jesus never appeared to his apostles after his departure, while we can find in many places that he appeared to Paul and guided. This evokes a deep sense of suspicion on the person that appeared to Paul in the form of Jesus.

Ananias, the disciple at Damascus knew that what kind of man was Paul and his purpose in coming over to Damascus. But it surprises that an apostle specially elected by Jesus (after his departure), who by his abnormal way of preaching - outraged the Jews and disgusted them so much as they could not remain in peace until they planned to kill him, was kept hidden from the notice of the apostles at Jerusalem.

However Paul was brought to the apostles and was acquainted with, by one Barnabas. Who made him apostle is nowhere found but his name is found mentioned together with the name of Paul -- as an apostle.<sup>3</sup> And we find some other people in epistles and in the book of Acts to have been given this title. If apostleship were so cheap there remains no meaning in particularly electing Paul as an apostle by Jesus.

---

1. Acts 9:26

2. Acts 9:15, Acts 9:13-14

3. Acts 14:14

However church maintains that he was made an apostle by Holy Ghost under the following passage-

*... the Holy Ghost said separate me Barnabas and Saul [Paul] for the work where unto I have called them. -Acts 13:2*

From the above passage it can be inferred that Barnabas and Saul [Paul] were made apostles by Holy Ghost (*...whereunto I have called them*). If it were taken for granted, all the statements of Paul that show how and by whom he was made an apostle can be proved false. The option is left to the church whether they take the statements of Paul showing that he was made apostle by Jesus - or the word of Holy Ghost, under reference, which infers to mean that Paul and Barnabas were made apostles by him (Holy Ghost), as an answer for our query that who made Barnabas as an apostle is not known. If the former is accepted the word of Holy Ghost is proved false: and our query still sustains. If the latter is accepted, the statements as made by Paul are proved to be false.

Thus we read in Acts. 9:26,27

*And when Saul(Paul) was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples : but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.*

*-Acts 9:26,27*

What another striking point is- it is not known whether Barnabas accompanied Paul from Damascus or the native of Jerusalem. As a matter of fact he was as unacquainted with the apostles as Paul himself. Then a curious question comes that how the apostles who did not believe that Paul was a disciple, accepted him on a mere recommendation of Barnabas? And how did they believe the word of Barnabas? Do all these things not appear as something unusual?

Here at Jerusalem also Paul preached boldly and disputed against the Grecians(In Telugu version - Greek speaking Jews), but they went about to slay him. Knowing this the brethren brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Acts 9:29-30

Here one thing that perplexes is that what was the cause of the Jews in attempting to kill Paul leaving all other disciples.(?) Reason may be explained as that he was preaching the Gospel. Well if that be the case the disciples were also preaching -- were not they ?

*A)Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word. -Acts 8:4*

*B) Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John. -Acts 8:14*

*C) And they, when they had testified and preached the word of the Lord, returned to Jerusalem, and preached the Gospel in many villages of the Samaritans. -Acts 8:25*

In the light of these facts, the plans to kill Paul leaving all the disciples and the apostles, lead to conclude that Paul's teachings were not relevant to the teachings of apostles. This discloses that he had taught contrary to the teachings of Jesus.

As according to one facet of the coin, Paul started his preachings first at Damascus. The news of his perverse teachings might have reached to the apostles at Jerusalem. This was why they did not receive him.

*And when Saul(Paul) was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples : but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. -Acts 9:26*

From the above passage the clause "And believed not that he was a disciple," is noteworthy.

Had he really been a sincere repentant, why should they hesitate to receive him as a disciple, whom they knew to be one as an open persecutor ?

Can any open persecutor cause more harm when he entered in as a disciple than being an outsider? To be frank they feared not for the persecution but they feared, if he were allowed as a disciple that he would collapse the very foundation of the church.

They might have been informed by the other disciples that how Paul preached at Arabia and Damascus for about 4 or 5 years<sup>1</sup>. Then, were they not in know, whether he was persecuting the church or persecuting Jesus himself by his false doctrines ? or could they have not noticed about his change in behaviour and attitude ? They were certainly in know of his change. Had he come as Saul - persecutor, they would not have cared at all. But his change as a disciple (Paul) intimidated them that he would demolish the church with all his wrong dogmas. Not only this but they were seeking for an opportunity to put an end to Paul and his church. Why ? Because, as is already mentioned, that he claimed that he was made by Jesus an apostle for Gentiles and began to preach every where contrary to the commonly agreed main beliefs and basic tenets of the religion(Acts 24:5 & Acts 28:22). This is all about one facet of the coin. Now let us see the other facet of the same coin. Please refer to the letter written to Galatians by his own hand or dictation to a Scribe.

*But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace*

*To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood :*

*Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.*

*Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and abode with him fifteen days.*

*But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.*

*Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not*  
-Galatians. 1:15-20

From the above passage it is learnt that when Paul was made an apostle to Gentiles, he did not meet any of the apostles but straightway went to Arabia and then came again to Damascus. Then after three years he went to see Peter and stayed with him for fifteen days at Jerusalem. He also saw James the brother of the Lord. Except these two, he met none from the apostles. I need not point out that how irrelevant is this information to the events as made mention in the first facet of the coin. Thus the two facets of the same coin provide irrelevant documents of events. Apostles at Jerusalem might have issued warnings to all churches

---

1. Galatians1:15-18+Acts9:23-25

not to allow Paul and his main associate Barnabas for ministration. This point we can understand from the epistle(letter) of Paul to Corinthians wherein he enquires why alone he himself and Barnabas should refrain from ministration... "Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working ?(I Corinthians 9:6)"

Not only this but also might have ordered him(Paul) not to appear in Jerusalem.

*A. And finding disciples, we tarried there [Tyre] seven days: Who said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem. -Acts 21:4*

*B. And as we tarried there [Caesarea] many days, there came down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles. And when we heard these things, both we and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, what mean ye to weep and to break mine heart ? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done. -Acts 21:10-14*

From the above two passages, it can be noticed that a message had been sent to Paul with a warning of bitter consequences if he were to enter into Jerusalem.

But the present church being the followers of Paul, edited the verses to mean as to have been declared by the spirit. Thus the real sense and spirit have been veiled so as to keep away the facts from the notice of the present christians.

How skilfully manipulated the context by the present church! It is so written that spirit had told to the disciples and disciples had persuaded Paul not to go to Jerusalem. Why not the spirit himself should say directly to Paul? Why again disciples as mediators between Paul and Spirit ?

In the second event Paul was at Caesarea. There came a certain prophet named Agabus, from Judaea. He brought the message from the Holy Ghost forbidding Paul to enter into Jerusalem as the Jews of Jerusalem would hand over Paul to Gentiles.

Who this Holy Ghost had been, seems to be a very peculiar person. In Tyre also he informed the disciples leaving Paul, the person concerned. In Caesarea also leaving Paul, he informed through a prophet who was far off at Judaea. The prophet Agabus comes to Caesarea binds himself with the girdles of Paul and informs them - *"so saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles"* (Acts 21:10-11).

It is just between ourselves : Would the spirit and Paul not converse with each other ? Then why not the spirit should say to Paul directly what he had to say instead through the mediators ? Well ! under the pressure of inevitable circumstances, Spirit could not have informed to Paul directly but had conveyed the message through the disciples (mediators) that he should not go to Jerusalem, had not he ?

Even if Paul had least regard and respect towards Holy Ghost and in his instructions - Could ever Paul had insisted on going to Jerusalem saying that he was ready not only to be bound but also even to die for the name of the Lord Jesus? What a great mystery is this ! for the name of Jesus Paul was ready to die, but Holy Spirit was not willing to leave Paul in adversities. From this it appears that Holy Ghost was not at all courageous but Paul became more courageous who did not care even his life.

But what surprises one is - just a little while earlier to these two incidents - Paul himself proclaims : "And now behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem ... (Acts 20:22)" This speaks that Holy Ghost would take him to Jerusalem, not taking his consent. However these dialectic statements may appear to Paulines (present Christians) as unquestionable axioms but sound ridiculous to the reasoning of readers.

Somehow or the other Paul reached to Jerusalem. But what more surprising is "And it came to pass, that when I [Paul] was come again to Jerusalem even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw him [Jesus] saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem : for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me" (Acts 22:17-18).

A) Holy Ghost brings Paul to Jerusalem (Acts 20:22).

B) Holy Ghost apprehended if Paul were allowed to go to Jerusalem, the Jews would handover him to Gentiles (Acts 21:4, 10-12).

C) Paul was firm with determinant will even to die at Jerusalem for Jesus' name (Acts 21:13). But

D) Jesus drives him out of Jerusalem predelecting that his (Paul's) stay at Jerusalem any longer was mere waste, as the people of that place would not receive his testimony concerning him [Jesus] (Acts 22:17,18).

One needs no hesitation to regard the above four passages under ABCD as conspicuous artifice of the church rather than contradiction by oversight.

From the foregoing events one can presume that warnings to Paul from Peter's church were given forbidding him from entering in to Jerusalem. But to screen over these facts the present church has involved the part of Holy Ghost and thus blasphemed and made the matter more complicated.

The apostles and the disciples of Peter's church had attempted to  
kill Paul at Jerusalem with the help of Jews.

*And when Saul [Paul] was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples : but they were all afraid of him and believed not that he was a disciple.*

*But Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.*

*And he was with them, coming in and going out at Jerusalem.*

*And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians [in Telugu version it is, - as Greek speaking Jews] : but they went about to slay him.*

*Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. -Acts 9:26-30*

*".....but they went about to slay him."*

Who were they that went about to slay Paul ? The context provides the answer as they were Grecians(Greek speaking Jews according to Telugu version). Why had they tried to kill him ? Because he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against them. This is how these things have been edited by the present church. So it is done, in the interest of the present christians that they might take the matter very seriously offended, if they come to know the fact that the apostles and their followers themselves had tried to kill Paul. Why only the grecians(Greek Jews) were enemies of Paul ? And were the Hebrew Jews friends ? And why had they tried to kill Paul alone leaving all other disciples at Jerusalem? was it because that he spoke boldly in the name of Jesus ? Then were not the apostles and their followers preaching and speaking boldly in the name of Jesus?

*And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ. -Acts 5:42*

Thus the followers of Peter's church were constantly preaching from door to door - not secretly : but used to preach in the temple also. Then leaving all of them, why Paul alone had been attempted to be killed is the question that makes one to think seriously about.

As a matter of fact this event was not taken affect to, as recorded, when Paul came to Jerusalem after having been baptized by Ananias at Damascus.<sup>1</sup> But it was the event which actually took place when Paul came to Jerusalem in second time after a very long period of 18-20 year's ministry at other places.<sup>2</sup>

It does not mean that he had never gone to Jerusalem before. He went once for a 15 days' short visit to assess the progress of his mission after four years after he was baptized. Not openly. But secretly not being seen of apostles.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Acts 9:17-30

2. Galatians 2:1

3. Galatians 1:15-20

Thus by the time of this event Paul had preached 20years in Arabia, Damascus, Syria, Caeasaria, then once again he came to Jerusalem.

He explains the reason for his going to Jerusalem.

*Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.*

*And I went up by revelation, **and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles**, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run in vain. -Galatians 2:1-2*

Paul proclaimed many times that he was made apostle for Gentiles. Were he really appointed for Gentiles why did he preach among those that were elected(but privately to them which were of reputation.)?

This point explicitly points out that there were two kinds of Gospels. One that which was being preached by apostles of Jesus among Jews and the other one by Paul which was not in conformity with the preachings of apostles. More often, Paul preached indirectly by letters rather than in person; and some times by his disciples too<sup>1</sup>.

*a. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia and returned again unto Damascus. -Galatians 1:17*

*b. But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me : God accepteth no man's person:) For they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me. -Galatians 2:6*

Paul openly declares that he had not learnt anything from elected ones(apostles). And he accepts that he never cared any of them however great one might be. But what more surprising is he went there to teach his gospel to them.<sup>2</sup>

These two passages make out that there was no relevance between their gospels. One wanted to convince the other by one's own

---

1. Galatians 1:20-24 + Colossians 4:16

2. Galatians 2:1-2

gospel(doctrines).

And again from the following we can understand that the two groups fought tooth and nail to attract the believers from each party by the other, and likewise each one tried to protect one's own followers, not being carried away by the other one.

a) *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:*

*Which is not another : but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*

*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*

*As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.*  
-Galatians. 1:6-9

From this passage it can be noticed that the Galatians who accepted the Pauline teachings earlier, had later rejected them and joined the church of Peter. Hence Paul entreats them not to accept any other Gospel than that of his own and further curses the other gospel preacher. And at the same time he dismayed them by cursing the preacher of other gospel as accursed... which goes to mean that one who obeys him would be much more accursed.

b) *But I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the last your care of me hath flourished again, wherein ye were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity.* -Philippians 4:10

*" Now at the last your care of me hath flourished again ---"*

This clause from the above passage very convincingly says that the Philippians who first accepted the doctrines as propounded by Paul might have renounced their faith in them and might have been carried away by Peter's church. And again might have turned up to Paul. So Paul expresses his pleasure.

c) *Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.*  
-Philippians 4:15

From this verse also one can know that when Paul began his ministry no church had extended its help to him, except the Philippians themselves. This means that no church had accepted his gospel. But the consecutive 16,17,18 verses impress to mean as that no church had extended the financial aid. If it were so, did Paul go on preaching his gospel or collecting financial aid? Had he really gone for financial aid then the verses really convey the meaning that except Philippians no other church had arranged financial aid. If he had gone on preaching then it means that no other church except the Philippians had accepted his gospel. This point appears more appropriate. This articulation of the present church is proved wrong because Paul had never been a parasite, but he laboured for himself and earned his own bread.<sup>1</sup> If it were really concerning giving and receiving -- even the smallest pastors are well provided to meet their wants. If this be the fact would all churches had not rushed with their financial aid when a great person and apostle like Paul had appealed for it? This goes to prove that all those churches belonging to Peter had rejected the gospel of Paul except the Philippians. If church still insists to hide the fact and try to convince that it was the financial aid that was rejected by the other churches -- it means that they did not regard the person of Paul as deserving for Philanthropy even. This is far derogatory.

d) *Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law : to whom we gave no such commandment.* -Acts. 15:24

Please note that the underlined phrases of the above passage have been excluded from Telugu version.

From this also it can be noticed that some belonging to one party entered into the other party and preached their gospel. What gospel did they preach?

---

1. Acts 20:33-35

"The believers should be circumcised and the law must be followed meticulously." This discloses the fact that those were not observing the circumcision and Law. Then therefore these must be the people belonging to Paul's group, whom the people of Peter's church might have reconverted. So to get them back into their fold, it seems that Paul and Barnabas might have forged this letter<sup>1</sup> and imputed to have been written by the apostles themselves and sent through them (Paul & Barnabas). This is because Paul never met any of the apostles,<sup>2</sup> as concerning to that event.

Thus two churches - two gospels, two groups of people and two leaders - one contradicting the other, one trying to get a rise over the other, one declaring the other as having no right etc. are crystal clear from the above passages.

We are giving below similar verses which all go to prove that Paul cautions to be alert from the other group of people lest they might draw them back to their fold.

*For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.*

*Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. -Acts 20:29-31*

If one makes a deep probe, it can be made clear that the hostility was not among the Christians and Jews as is generally made to impress upon readers but between the church of Peter and the church of Paul.

### **THOSE THAT ATTEMPTED TO KILL PAUL - WERE NAZARENES AND JEWS**

Now the question is whether those that tried to kill Paul were Jews or the original followers of Jesus or both.

Difference of opinion is the root cause for all disputes. And without disputes between the parties, question of attempts to murder or suchlike reactions does not arise. If it were true that the Jews had attempted to kill Paul, the query comes that what was the reason behind in particularly

---

1. Acts 15:23-29    2. Galatians 1:17-20 + 2:1

aiming at Paul leaving the then original followers of Jesus and their leaders. As a matter of fact a great number of people who believed in Jesus were present there at Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>. Then, were their leaders not preaching about Jesus among the Jews? They did a great deal of door to door campaign<sup>2</sup>. Leaving all these people why did they target Paul, is the question that leads to conclude that it were not Jews, nor were they Gentiles as they were unconcerned with the affairs of Judaism and its sects; that had attempted to kill him but it were the original followers of Jesus, the then Peter's church. The main reason for this was the dispute between the Peter's church and Paul's on doctrinal and religious difference of opinion.

### **JESUS WAS NOT FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY - BUT REFORMER OF JUDAISM**

Jesus was sent to Israelites as a reformer, but not as a founder of a new religion under the banner of Christianity by giving them a new law and abrogating the old one.

*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.*

*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*

*Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes, and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. -Matthew 5:17-20*

The difference between establishment of a new religion and reformation of already existing religion must be clearly known. Establishment of a new religion is the outcome of the abrogation of the law and important tenets of the then existing religion and replacing them with new ones.

Reformation does not mean religious reformation, but it deeply involves in the reformation of the persons belonging to that particular reli-

---

1. Acts 21:20

2. Acts 5:42

gion. When the people follow that which has not been exhorted to do, and when religious commandments are not properly observed and when new doctrines such as have not been taught, are invented - in a situation such as this the people of that religion are guided aright and this act is known as reformation . This act does not affect the principles and main tenets and the law given through the book, but stands in favour of the reasoning and is convincive. It attracts the rational thinkers. Only irrational people go against the reformations.

The difference between the reformed ones and those that do not accept the reformations, confines to the extent on the reformed points only. But there cannot be any change in the principle tenets and beliefs. Law and the book and the places of worship all remain one and the same for both.

It is true that in the early period of Jesus' ministry, Jews could not accept Jesus as a reformer . But mistaking him to be one as creating heresy in their religion tried to kill him. But after him, his disciples continued to preach the mission exactly as had been commissioned to them. The Jews who did not like the teachings of his disciples continued the hostility and ceased not to harass them by every possible means<sup>1</sup>. But the constant efforts of the disciples in discharging their responsibility entrusted to them, achieved marvellous results. Hence the number of followers gradually increased to such an extent that the hostile Jews began to adjust themselves and preferred tolerance to humiliating them<sup>2</sup>.

The early followers of Jesus(Peter's party) remained only as a reformed sect of Judaism. They used to go to the synagogues and followed only Torah<sup>3</sup>. But when paul's church superseded Peter's mission, the churches as places of worship for christians, came into being as we see them today. And the New Testament has been compiled to be read in the churches. They(Paul's party) changed the name of Torah as Old Testament and combined it with their Gospels and the book of acts and epistles which altogether are called as New Testament and named the complete volume as The Bible.

a. *And I said, Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee;* -Acts 22:19

1. Acts 5:25-29      2. Acts 5:28,38,39,40  
3.Synagogue = place of worship for Jews. Torah = Scriptures revealed for Jews.

b. *And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities.* -Acts 26:11

These two verses clearly show that the places of worship for the early followers of Jesus (Peter's Party) were synagogues only. Hence it must be accepted that the way of worship, the Book to be followed all were one and the same for both the Jews and the early followers of Jesus. The disciples of Jesus, (Peter's party) strove to reform Jews by making them follow Torah and to refrain them from the following of the inventions. Their aim was to reform the Jews but not to establish a new religion. Thus those who accepted the reformations were called as a sect of Judaism - (ie) a sect of reformed Judaism. They came from all the twelve tribes of Israelites. They regarded themselves as ones that belong to the tribe which they came from ; but not as a separate sect as thirteenth tribe of Israelites. The Jews never accepted them as the sect of reformed Judaism but branded them as Nazarenes<sup>1</sup>. But for the Israelites and Nazarenes the law and the places of worship were one and the same.

#### NAZARENES AND JEWS BOTH REJECTED PAUL'S DOCTRINES

When Paul began to preach his own doctrines the Nazarenes did not accept but strongly objected. Therefore Paul named his early followers as" Jews among the gentiles<sup>2</sup>."

However when he gradually acquired some strength all around, then he established his independent churches and the followers were called christians <sup>3</sup>.

From above it is evident that three groups of people are being discussed. So to avoid confusion of our readers we prefer to name them as follows :

- 1) Jews (Those that did not accept the reformations of Jesus)
- 2) Nazarenes<sup>4</sup> (The Jews who accepted the reformations of Jesus-Peter's church.)
- 3) Paulines (Jews or gentiles or some belonging to peter's church who followed paul-Paul's church who later are called christians).

1. Acts 24:5      2. Acts 21:21      3. Acts 11:26  
4. To mean as the followers of the one that came from the city of Nazareth - Jesus.

The doctrines propounded by Paul became a problem and perturbed to both Jews and Nazarenes. Jews who accustomed for tolerance towards Nazarenes seeing Paul's attitude and strange preachings in the name of Jesus who happened to be a pivot of Nazarenes' preachings also, lost their composure towards Nazarenes. Nazarenes as a matter of fact were commissioned by Jesus for the reformation of the Jews. But finding the doctrines of Paul deadly and quite against to the original teachings of Jesus, they predicted if Paul and his attitude were not checked, that the original religion for whose protection they were brought forth into the field would soon disappear. And hence they began to protest Paul's mission so much as to root-out it from its existence. And their constant efforts in seeking to make an end of Paul and his mission rather consoled the Jews and they too extended their helping hand in this task. Yet the role of Nazarenes in attacking Paulines was rather more than the Jews.

#### PAUL PREACHED NEW DOCTRINES CONTRARY TO PETER'S

*...May we know what this new doctrine, where of thou speakest, is?*

*For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears...*

*-Acts 17:19-20*

The above verses speak clearly that Paul preached quite new doctrines. There were thousands of Nazarenes spread abroad among all nations of Jews. They preached Jesus. They spread Jesus' teachings so much so a great number of Jews joined the company of Nazarenes. Situation being thus, if Jews or others enquired Paul saying as -- May we know what this new doctrine, where of thou speakest is ? -- is a clear evidence that the doctrine of Paul appeared to them as a new doctrine and as strange things. This discloses the fact that Peter and the disciples and the followers of Jesus never preached such things as Paul preached.

#### The tragic point is that Paul proclaims that it is his gospel :

a) *Remember that Jesus christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel:* *-II Timothy 2:8*

b) *In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus christ according to my gospel.* *-Romans 2:16*

This shows clearly that what Paul had preached was his own gospel but not of Jesus. So it naturally goes against to the gospel of Jesus, as was being preached by Peter and other disciples.

#### WHEN PAUL CAME TO JERUSALEM --- ?

*And when we were come to Jerusalem the brethren received us gladly.(17)*

*And the day following Paul went in with us unto James: and all the elders were present. (18)*

*And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. (19)*

*And when they heard it, they glorified the lord, and said unto him, Thou seest brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all Zealous of the law; (20)*

*And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.(21)*

*What is it therefore ? the multitude must needs come together : for they will hear that thou art come . (22) -Acts 21:17-22*

Let us have a glance over the above passage.

The brethren of this verse (17) are not the disciples belonging to Peter's church, but the disciples of Paul. They were very few in number. They received Paul when he came to Jerusalem. He came there in secret not being known to the people of Peter's church.

According to verse (20) " **Thousands of Jews who believed** " means- there were thousands of Nazarenes of Peter's church. And another point of this verse is - " **They are zealous of the law.**" Thus they were strict followers of Jesus who ordained them to follow the law meticulously. For this purpose only he was made manifest and this was the mission of reformation they were commissioned with(Matt 5:17-20).

**"And they are informed of thee that thou teachest to forsake Moses"(21)** - (means to forsake the law). This discloses the fact that there were no friendly attachments between Peter's church and Paul's. And also that Paul was teaching against to the law.

*...the multitude must needs come together : for they will hear that thou art come (22)*

This is to say that Peter's party will hear about your(Paul's) arrival and they will come. Thus the expression of their fear of the people(Nazarenes) a clear testimony that Paul had been working secretly. And here we can find a clue that it were they that sought to kill Paul.

If it were true according to present church that those that sought to kill Paul were not the people of Peter's church as we contend, but the orthodox Jews who did not believe in Jesus-

a) There appears no reason for fear because there were thousands of Jews who believed in Jesus (Acts 21:20).

b) **And again** - 'And they were Jews who believed' **discloses the fact that they were all Peter's party.( Peter was an apostle appointed for Jews even according to Paul (Galatians 2:7).**

c) Paul's people apprehended the reaction of the Jews who believed and zealous of law- means, they feared the violent attack by the people belonging to Peter's church (Nazarenes).

And these points convincingly prove that the people of Paul were afraid of the people of Peter and it were they that sought to kill Paul.

But the present church being the followers of Paul(Paulines) took all possible precautions so that these facts are to be kept away from the knowledge of the present christians. It has been imputed so as to impress that the exchange of hot dialogues - disputes - differences of opinion which one can see from the book The Acts and Epistles of Paul, are due to the outcome of the misdeeds by the Jews and some hypocrites among themselves only but not between Peter's church and Paul's. Our further points in addition to what so far have been discussed, make clear what the fact is.

## **NO RELEVANCE BETWEEN TEACHINGS OF PETER AND OF PAUL - NO FRIENDLY ATTACHMENTS - BUT HOSTILITY PREVAILED**

### **Another Passage**

*And when the seven days were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him. (27)*

*Crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is the man, that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place. (28)*

*(29 is not necessary)*

*And all the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple; and forthwith the doors were shut.(30)*

*And as they went about to kill him, tidings came unto the Chief Captain of the band, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar.(31)*

*Who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them : and when they saw the chief captain and the soldiers, they left beating of Paul. (32)*

*Then the Chief Captain came near, and took him, and commanded him to be bound with two chains: and demanded who he was, and what he had done.(33) -Acts 21:27-33*

From the first verse (27) it can be noticed that the Jews from Asia, had stirred up the people and laid hands on him(Paul). This verse begins saying as - "And when the seven days were almost ended" which makes clear that until seventh day he was not tracked down by the attackers. This goes to prove that he had been disguised, so as not to be noticed by anyone. Or the event might have actually taken place on the very first day itself, but not on the seventh day as recorded.

As according to (30) all the city and people ran together and caught hold of Paul and drew him out of the temple, and verse (31) tells us that they went about to kill him.

And verses (32&33) speak of his arrest. Had the chief captain not interfered and rescued and arrested Paul, he would not have been remained alive<sup>1</sup>.

Then who these people were, that had been active in planning to kill Paul ?

As a reply to this, the verse (27) impresses upon the readers to think that it were the Jews that came from Asia.

If it were so -----

Why particularly the Jews that came from Asia ? Were there no Jews at Jerusalem ?

And moreover there were thousands of Peter's people at Jerusalem. If there was no hostility (or) if Paul were preaching in accordance with the teachings of Peter, would the people of Peter had not tried to save Paul from the hands of those that had attempted to kill him ? Where had all these people gone leaving Paul in such a critical situation ?

Do these points not hint to any serious reader to conclude that it were the people of Peter that had tried to kill Paul ? And to prevent from conceiving this thought, the church has impressed upon people to think that it were not Peter's people, but the Jews that came from Asia under verse (27).

If it were correct -----

#### **Paul says in his deposition before the Governor :**

*Whereupon certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple, neither with multitude, nor with tumult.*

*Who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had aught against me. -Acts 24:18-19*

The above passage discloses the fact that there was no role of the Jews that came from Asia. Then therefore it must be Jews or Nazarenes or both.

---

1. Acts 23:27

And again :

It is so written in the book of Acts that when Paul was in the custody of the chief captain that Lord appeared to Paul and said -

*" And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer; Paul : for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." -Acts 23:11*

What the significant point from this passage is that Jesus ordered Paul to testify about him in Rome also as he had testified at Jerusalem.

Who it was that appeared to Paul is not the thing that required immediate attention, but what was it that he had ordered to Paul is the important thing necessary to be discussed.

He ordered Paul to testify about him in Rome also as he had testified in Jerusalem. This speaks very clearly that nobody had ever testified about him at Jerusalem as Paul had testified.

#### **In this regard some queries :**

A) were there no followers of Jesus at Jerusalem ?

Why not : there were thousands of disciples at Jerusalem.  
-Acts 21:20

B) Then were they not testifying about Jesus ?

They had been testifying about Jesus constantly (Acts 5:42).

These facts infer that there was no concern at all between the teachings of Paul and Peter. Peter was preaching according as had been ordained by Jesus while Paul according to the instructions given by one who appeared him as Jesus in his vision ...*for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.*

As a matter of fact there was no personal enmity between Paul and Jews or Paul and Nazarenes. But hostility between them was due to the doctrines that were being preached by Paul. This points out more convincingly that the teachings of Paul were deadly to both Jews and Nazarenes. So Jews became hands in gloves with Nazarenes in seeking opportunity to make an end of Paul and his mission.

And again the person who induced Paul to testify him in Rome also as he testified at Jerusalem, if were Jesus himself, why did not he appear before thousands of his followers so as to make them testify in the same manner as had been by Paul himself ?

Did Jesus debar Peter's church so as to run after Paul's ?

#### **The chief captain transferred the case to the Governor Felix.**

Tirtullus the orator on behalf of the accusers, complained to the Governor with the following accusations against Paul.

*For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world and a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes:*

*Who also hath gone about to profane the temple : whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. -Acts 24:5-6*

From the above we find three main accusations.

- A) Paul was accused to have been a pestilent and was a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world.
- B) And also a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes.
- C) And was about to profane the Temple.

The first allegation says that Paul was creating disorder among the Jewish community all over the world.

The second says that Paul was a ringleader of the dissent group(sect) of Nazarenes.

These two points are crucial in proving that the complainants were both Jews and Nazarenes together.

The following verse makes it more vivid :

*" And the Jews also assented, saying that these things were so."*  
-Acts 24:9

In this we find Jews accepting all accusations made against Paul as true. If Jews accepted what was said about Paul as correct, who else could have been the main accusers other than Nazarenes ? So it is evident that Nazarenes were main accusers and Jews were witnesses. However both wanted to get rid of Paul. Does this not prove that the part of those who sought to kill Paul was more of Nazarenes than of the Jews?

What another point which strengthen our argument is --

*And he commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or come unto him. -Acts 24:23*

From the above we came to know that the Governor Felix commanded a centurion to keep Paul under custody with complete liberty and not to object if anybody of his acquainted people came to meet or minister him.

But what a curious fact is that nobody did come either to see him or to minister. Thousands of Peter's people were present at Jerusalem, the place of offence<sup>1</sup>. If they were friendly with Paul, would they had not called upon him to see and minister their fellow worker in christ ? A few number of Paul's people were also there<sup>2</sup>. But when they had seen the ill - fate of their master, they might have slipped into underground. Do all these points not prove that there was great hostility prevailing among the people of Peter and Paul ?

### **PROSECUTION AGAINST PAUL**

One should not misunderstand that a criminal case had been filed by people in the court of the Governor Felix, against Paul. But they had attempted to kill dragging him out of the temple. Knowing this the chief captain, Claudius Lysias rushed to take him into his custody and thus Paul had been rescued. Had the chief captain not arrested him, Paul could not have been remained alive<sup>3</sup>.

*And as they went about to kill him, tidings came unto the chief captain of the band, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar.*

---

1. Acts 21:20

2. Acts 21:17

3. Acts 23:27

*Who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them; and when they saw the chief captain and the soldiers, they left beating of Paul.*

*Then the chief captain came near, and took him and commanded him to be bound with two chains, and demanded who he was and what he had done. -Acts 21:31-33*

In reply to the demand of the chief captain who he was and what he had done, the people complained against him some as one thing and others as something else. A great uproar was there. To know of certainty the nature of complaints, he arranged the council of priests and examined the case on the day following. This discloses the fact that the accusations against Paul were purely doctrinal based<sup>1</sup>. And on knowing that a conspiracy to make an end of him(Paul)was plotted, the chief captain arranged to send Paul to the Governor Felix under his guard safely with a letter.

The letter of the chief captain reads as follows :

*Cladius Lysias unto the most excellent Governor Felix sendeth greeting.*

*This man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed of them; then came I with an army and rescued him, having understood that he was a Roman*

*And when I would have known the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their council :*

*Whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds*

*And when it was told me how that the Jews laid wait for the man, I sent straightway to thee, and gave commandment to his accusers also to say before thee what they had against him. Farewell.*

*-Acts 23:26-30*

Thus the chief captain transferred the case to the Governor Felix at Caesarea. Both accused and the accusers were present at Caesarea before the Governor Felix.

---

1. Acts 23:29

When the trial of the case was opened one orator by name Tertullus, on behalf of the accusers presented his charges against Paul as follows:

Prosecution :

*For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world and a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes who also hath gone about to profane the temple : whom we took and would have judged according to our law. -Acts 24:5-6.*

Prosecution witness : The above accusations were witnessed and accepted as true by the Jews.

*And the Jews also assented, saying that these things were so.*

*-Acts 24:9*

Here it is predictable that nazarenes - the early followers of Jesus under the leadership of Peter might have been the accusers and the Jews were their witnesses. However both wanted to get rid of Paul. That is why Jews became hands in gloves with the Nazarenes who accused against Paul, standing by their side as witnesses.

" *The Jews also assented saying that these things were so.*" The words such as these clearly point out that the accusers were neither the Jews, as they witnessed saying that these things were so(as the accusers claimed) nor were they Gentiles as they have nothing to do with Jews' or Nazarenes' affairs and more over there was no any such allegation against Paul as to prove that the accusers were Gentiles. But accusers and the witnesses jointly Proclaim for the affairs relating to the Jews and Nazarenes, which shows that both of them wanted that Paul should be eliminated from the world.

Thus having been rescued by the chief captain, Paul was put under the custody of the Governor Felix and those that attempted to kill him turned as accusers and witnesses. Here one must keep in mind that there were two groups of people deeply involved in the attempt to kill Paul who was the ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Acts 24:5-6

Taking into consideration the main accusation-" *a mover of sedition among all jews and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes* "it can be well established that the Nazarenes became divided under two groups - one under the leadership of Peter and the other, the dissent sect under the leadership of Paul. As the Jews were witnesses on behalf of the accusers it is made clear that the followers of Jesus under the leadership of Peter were the main party in attempting to kill who later turned as accusers and the Jews as their witnesses. Thus it can be well established that it were both Jews and the early followers of Jesus under the leadership of Peter that had attempted to kill Paul.

### PAUL - FOUNDER OF HERETIC SECT

To know whether Paul was really a leader to the dissent group which was branded as heretic sect of Nazarenes, we have another strong witness in which Paul himself admitted when he was asked by some Jews of Rome to explain them about this sect saying "*we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest : for as concerning this sect we know that every where it is spoken against*"<sup>1</sup>.

" We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest " **means as saying "What do you say about this sect "** about which there is controversy every where (*every where it is spoken against*).

**Here what noteworthy is he did not condemn that sect but in its favour** he explained his doctrines which some believed and some believed not (Acts 28:22-24).

Here what one should know is, not whether what he expounded is correct, but to know whether it was Paul who was the leader of the dissent group is more important. It is proved beyond doubt by his own admission.

### PAUL'S CHURCH WAS BRANDED HERETIC - PAUL CONFESSES

Further Paul confessed before the Governor Felix saying in clear terms - "*But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy so worship I the God...*"(Acts 24:14). To say in other words, " I preach and

---

1. Acts 28:22

practise exactly after the way which they call heresy..." Does this point leave any ambiguity to know that Paul was leading the heretic dissent group? Dissent group means that which came out of (or separated from) the original group. This convincingly proves that the teachings of Paul bear no relevance with the teachings of Peter and his church.

*" Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me :*

*That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea, and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints; That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed."* -Romans 15:30-32

From the above passage we notice Paul beseeching Romans to pray God for his successful release from the hands of unbelievers of Judea and to make his mission acceptable by the Saints of Jerusalem. Here the word ' Saints ' refers to the Apostles who were present in Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>. Paul's wish that his mission might be accepted by the Saints, is a clear proof which reveals the fact that it had not so far been given sanction and on the other hand it was contradicted by them. And this was the reason why Paul earnestly beseeched the help of Romans by praying God to see that his mission might be made successful at Jerusalem by the acceptance of Saints.

### ACCORDING TO ACCUSERS - PAUL PREACHED DOGMAS OF SUPERSTITION AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS

When Paul was caught by the people in the temple they shouted for help saying -

*Men of Israel, help : this is the man, that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place; and further brought Greeks also into the temple and hath polluted this holy place* -Acts 21:28

In this passage we find people, who caught Paul shouting for help - they called particularly " O men of Israel." In our earlier pages we have

---

1. Acts 9:13

mentioned that the places of worship, books to be read, the law to be followed(except the reformed points) and the way of prayer- all were one and the same for both Jews and the early followers of Jesus. They(early followers of Jesus) had no special places of worship such as churches as we see them these days. They used to go to synagogues only, for worship.<sup>1</sup> They regarded themselves as a reformed sect of Judaism only, but not as christians as such. Christ preached no religion of his own. He propounded reformations only. Many Jews did not accept the reformations suggested, but thought him to be a law-breaker. Very few Jews who believed on him regarded themselves as a reformed sect of Judaism. They remained only as Jews. They never formed as a new thirteenth tribe of Israelites but remained in their original tribe from which they came<sup>2</sup>. But Jews did not give sanction to this but called them as Nazarenes so that they might be specifically identified as the ones that believed on Christ.<sup>3</sup> This was the reason why Nazarenes were in the main synagogue of Jerusalem and on finding Paul they caught him and called the Jews for help saying 'o men of Israel'<sup>4</sup>. This point also proves that those who attacked Paul to kill, were no other than Nazarenes, and their helpers were Jews. They said showing Paul - *"This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people and the law."*

*" Teaching all men everywhere against the law"* is possible, but *teaching all men everywhere against the people* is not possible but a ridiculous thing. So it can be well concluded that they might have originally said " all men everywhere against the APOSTLES,"(or) "against the Jews, but not against people as recorded." This point also makes clear that the people who attempted to kill Paul were both Nazarenes and Jews.

*" Against the law "*

As regards to the law we know how dead against Paul had been towards the law. Comprehensive discussions have been made in our earlier pages. And we also know that Jews and Nazarenes were strict observers of the law though there were some lapses in the former ones' case. Then therefore it was the incumbent duty of safeguarding the law for both jews and Nazarenes and the latter ones were more responsible. So it is obvious fact that those who called for help were no other than the Jews and Nazarenes themselves and these are the people who attempted to kill Paul.(*This is the man that teacheth all men against the law*).

1. Acts 9:2, 22:19, 26:11    2. Even according to paul Acts 26:7 & Galatians 2:15  
3. Acts 24:5    4. the word 'Israel' includes Nazarenes too.

Heresy : What was the heresy that was preached and practised by Paul for which cause he was aggressively attacked by people to be killed mercilessly ?

Let us find out from his statements which he deliberately made in his depositions on different occasions in presence of different authorities -

No sooner was he rescued by the chief captain than he took permission to address the people -

He addressed the people in presence of the chief captain Claudius Lysias :

A) *... Men and brethren I am a pharisee the son of a pharisee of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.*  
-Acts 23:6

Before the Governor Felix :

B) *Except it be for this one voice that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead, I am called in question by you this day.* -Acts. 24:21

Before the Governor Festus and the king Agrippa. :

C) *... that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a pharisee. (5)*

*unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews.(7)*

*Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead ? (8)* -Acts 26:5,7,8

In the foregoing statements of Paul, we find Paul calling himself as a pharisee. It means, a staunch believer and follower of the law. This goes to mean that he claimed himself as a correct follower of the law. And in other words he denied to have spoken any thing against the law. This is to say that "he was not against to the law as they accused him of." Our readers can well judge the point whether he preached against to the law or in favour of it.

The another point from the foregoing statements is - "*the hope of the resurrection of the dead*" means belief in the resurrection of dead. If it were really the belief in the resurrection of the dead to mean as general resurrection, there could have been no such a great tumult and adversity as to entice the people to kill Paul. Right from the beginning every prophet had taught about the General Resurrection as it is appointed for the judgment of God, and all the Jews and Nazarenes and christians believe in it<sup>1</sup>. Then therefore Paul had not taught any such blasphemous new thing as that he should be killed. Then therefore it is perceivable that he might have declared some thing other than the General Resurrection which was regarded as heresy.

In this regard we can ascertain some information from the deposition given by Paul himself before the Governor, Felix .

*Except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day. -Acts. 24:21*

The above passage also seems as suggestive for General resurrection . Did he preach really about General resurrection ?

If it were for general resurrection, there would have been no problem at all. But he preached something referring to something else.

Then what was it that he had really preached about, for which, a great tumult was made ? The answer can be ascertained from the following.

(After Felix) - the Governor Festus takes charge and hears the arguments of the two parties and expresses his opinion before king Agrippa and Barnabas as follows -

*Against whom when the accusers stood up they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed:*

*But had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. -Acts. 25:18,19*

---

1. Acts 24:14-15 + 26:6-8

This passage means as saying - the main accusations against Paul were on **mere superstition** of religious dogmas and the **resurrection of Jesus**. We came to know that the accusers were Nazarenes and the witnesses were Jews. Then therefore, according to the Governor Festus, **Nazarenes accused against Paul that he was preaching dogmas of superstition and the resurrection of Jesus**. This was the main heresy that Paul preached everywhere according to both Jews & Nazarenes.

The same thing can be inferred from the first information record (F.I.R. as recorded by the chief captain Claudius Lysias) also which can be found from the letter written to Governor Felix-(Acts. 23:28-30).

*Whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds. -Acts. 23:29*

Thus the whole mystery has been made crystal clear that Paul was preaching all contrary to the commonly agreed dogmas as were being followed by Peter's church.

Does this point not prove that the rivalry was between Paul and the church of Peter ?

And hence it goes without saying that it was the group of Peter who attempted to kill Paul with the help of Jews.

## Was Paul really made an apostle by Jesus?

As regards to Paul all the four gospels are silent. They provide no vestige information about him. But we find in the book of the Acts that he persecuted the church. He took the letters from the chief priest to Synagogues of Damascus so as the people of that faith might be brought bound to Jerusalem. But on the way to Damascus, when he was about to reach almost to Damascus ---

### Jesus appears to him in vision -

*And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus : and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, 'Saul, Saul, Why persecutest thou me ? And he said who art thou Lord ? And the*

*Lord said 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest : it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.*

on seeing this vision Paul becomes blind, and his associates bring him to Damascus (Acts 9:3-8).

In the vision of one Ananias the devout disciple, Jesus asked him to go and meet Paul saying --

*... Go thy way; for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and Kings and the children of Israel. - Acts. 9:10-15*

The same event has been repeated by Paul himself before all the audience in defence on trial before chief captain Lysias. In this, he quotes Ananias to have told him that he was made an apostle for all men. (Acts. 22:1-30)

We can also see the same event as repeated by Paul in his deposition in defence on trial before the king Agrippa and the governor Festus. In this it has not been specifically said for whom he was commissioned to be an apostle. But can be inferred taking into consideration of the verse(17) that he was made an apostle for entire mankind(Acts26:12-19).

The above are three statements we find in the book of the Acts. The former one as has been narrated by its writer while the latter two consecutively to have been mentioned in his deposition by Paul in defence on trial before audience in presence of the chief captain Cladius Lysias and the king Agrippa and governor Festus respectively.

### **As regards to his apostleship he writes in his own epistle(letter) to Galatians --**

*But when it pleased God; who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood. -Galatians. 1:15-16*

This speaks that Paul was made an apostle, by God for heathens(Gentiles): And in the same letter he writes to impress upon the Galatians to take him as an apostle appointed by Jesus for Gentiles (Galatians 2:7-9).

According to the book of Acts, Paul was an apostle for both heathens and Israelites. But according to his own letter he was for heathens(Gentiles) only. A grave contradiction is obvious between the two statements. He was made apostle whether by God or Jesus or Holy Ghost<sup>1</sup> cannot be decisively established. we are not discussing about the contradictions. They are innumerable in the Bible. Apparent contradictions may be explained and clarified. But decisive contradictions never be answered except as its defender should take shelter in the attitude of escapism -

If Paul were an apostle for Gentiles - why did he give priority to Jews? Now let us examine some passages....

*A. And straightway he preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he is the Son of God. -Acts. 9:20*

The above passage reveals that Paul, immediately after he was made an apostle, went into the Synagogues, to preach Jesus Christ.

*B. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. -Acts. 13:46*

From the above passage it can be noticed that all Israelites rejected Paul and so he preferred to go to Gentiles, and in its consecutive verse he explains the important reason in going to Gentiles -

*For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. -Acts. 13:47*

In the above passage(B) he declares that he would go to Gentiles as he was the salvation for the entire mankind. But now the question is - did he really go to Gentiles from there ?

No. But he went to the synagogue - means Israelites. Thus we read from the following.

---

1. Acts 13:2

C. *And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the Synagogue of the jews, and so spake, that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed.*

-Acts. 14:1

From the above it can be noticed that in the Synagogue of Iconium Jews and Greeks believed on Paul and Barnabas. Jews in Synagogue is a natural point but how were there the Greeks in the temple? Jews thought that taking Greeks in to temple as an act of polluting the Synagogue<sup>1</sup>. Then does this point not prove that they who believed along with Jews in the Synagogue were not Greeks? Then who were they? They might have been the people of Peter's church.

D. *Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a Synagogue of the Jews: and Paul, as his manner was went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures."*

-Acts. 17:1-2

From the above his(Paul) particular manner of going into the Synagogues of Jews can be noticed.

E. *And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea : who coming thither went into the Synagogue of the Jews.*

-Acts. 17:10

The above verse also gives emphasis that he(Paul) preached in the Synagogues of Jews. If he was driven out of one Synagogue, he used to enter the other.

F. *Therefore disputed he in the Synagogue with the Jews and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him.*

-Acts. 17:17

This passage also gives an information that Paul went into a Synagogue and disputed with the Jews and the devout persons. Here also we find two groups of people, (viz.,) (1) The Jews and (2) the devout persons. Who were the devout people of this Synagogue? If they were to mean Jews themselves, no specific mention as "devout people" is nec-

---

1. Acts 21:28

essary. Though devout or wicked and whatever - they all come under one term 'Jews'. And more over it is not practicable to discriminate people on characteristic basis such as devout or wicked for a stranger. And his message was for all Jews. Hence stating such as "preached to Jews or disputed with Jews" is enough if it were Jews really to mean by the words devout persons. But here what we predict is that the word devout stands for Nazarenes. If they were really Jews how could they become devout not believing Jesus? Hence he disputed with Jews and Nazarenes of the synagogue.

G) *And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.*

-Acts 18:4

*And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ.*

-Acts 18:5

*And when they opposed themselves and blasphemed he shook his raiment and said unto them your blood be upon your own heads: I am clean, from hence forth I will go unto the Gentiles."*

-Acts 18:6

From the above we find Paul persuading to believe on his gospel to both Jews and Greeks(18:4). It is the event that took place in the synagogue on every Sabbath. As regards to the Greeks we have explained in our point c- (under Ref Acts 14:1). They were not really Greeks. But they might have been the followers of Jesus under the leadership of Peter(i.e) Nazarenes.

And again (in 18:6) it is so written 'when they opposed themselves' - Paul said to them that he would thenceforth go to the Gentiles.

Did he really go to the Gentiles from there?

H) No- but he entered into the synagogue and reasoned with Jews.

*And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews.*

-Acts 18:19

I) *And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue...*

-Acts 18:26

*J. For he mightily convinced the Jews and that publickly shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was christ. -Acts 18:28*

*K. And he went into the synagogue and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the Kingdom of God. -Acts 19:8*

On one hand claiming that he was made apostle for Gentiles and yet on the other hand going to the synagogues of Jews to preach his Gospel, is a clear sign that he targeted both Jews and Nazarenes rather than Gentiles. However as soon as he declared himself to be an apostle for Gentiles he began to preach his doctrines - not among Gentiles but among Nazarenes primarily and Jews secondarily. Where do one can find Nazarenes ? As we told earlier they used to go to synagogues of Jews for worship. This point we can understand from the statement of Paul himself<sup>1</sup>.

From all the foregoing passages and our arguments one cannot miss to find Paul going to synagogues of Jews most preferably. Further in clear terms he explains the reason in going to Jerusalem where he was attempted to be killed. Read the following passage -

*Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation lest by any means I should run or had run invain. -Galatians 2:1-2*

From this passage one can understand that Paul went to Jerusalem Temple of Jews to preach his doctrines to them. Does this point not prove that his target was mainly Nazarenes and Jews, rather than the Gentiles?

**Paul sees Jesus as light** : Paul explains that how he was made an additional apostle --

*And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me,*

---

1. Acts 9:2, 22:19 & 26:11

*And I fell unto the ground and heard a voice saying unto me Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ?*

*And I answered, who art thou, lord ? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.*

*And they that were with me saw indeed the light and were afraid, but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.*

*And I said what shall I do Lord ? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.*

*And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus.*

*-Acts 22:6-11*

From the above passage it can be ascertained that a light appeared and a voice was heard.

On seeing the light what had happened, Paul further explains--

*" And I fell unto the ground "-* Thus Paul fell on the ground. But it is not mentioned whether they that were with him fell on the ground or not<sup>1</sup>.

*And heard a voice saying unto me ' I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest'...*

Both Paul(Saul) and the men that were with him saw the light(not the person) which declared that it was Jesus. Except Paul,no other man heard the voice. On seeing the light Paul fell down to the earth and became blind.But the people who were with him, though were afraid, they were able to see because they did not become blind. The same light Paul and others did see, but others did not lose their sight while Paul did lose. The reason for this may be explained by the church saying that the "glory"of the light was not seen by them. Hence they did not lose their eyesight. But the GLORY of the light was seen by Paul and it was the reason for his losing of the sight. But one wonders as how the GLORY of the light became a curse for Paul in making him blind instead of a boon or favour.

---

1. But in another occasion he says that all people who accompanied him also fell down to the ground. -Acts 26:14

Paul asked the Light(Jesus) that what should he do. But he did not instruct him as to what he had to do but advised him to go to Damascus where he should be explained all that was appointed for him to do.

Then therefore he was led to Damascus by the people who were with him (Acts 22:1-11).

#### **At Damascus : Ananias meets Paul**

*And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there.*

*-Acts 22:12*

#### **some points about Ananias :**

- 1) His name was Ananias.
- 2) A devout man who led his life according to the law.
- 3) Ananias may be a native of Damascus or had been dwelling there since a long period. This can be predicted from- *"having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there."*
- 4) He had a very good report of all the Jews who dwelt there.

As a matter of fact the Light of Jesus which appeared to Paul should have directed him to go to Jerusalem where all (many of his) apostles were present - instead to Damascus. And he should have appointed Peter the chief leader of his mission to baptize Paul. But the Light of Jesus preferred Ananias a devout person. However great devout person he might be, he could not be equal to Peter. Leaving all his apostles, Jesus' running after other persons, leaves no ambiguity to form some doubt as to why Jesus had neglected all his apostles.

*" Came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, Saul receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him."*

*-Acts 22:13*

The sight which was lost on seeing the GLORY of Light(Jesus) was restored by a simple command of a devout person Ananias. The power of GLORY which made blind was made powerless by one devout person by his simple command - 'Receive thy sight'. Thus his lost sight was restored. The mystery remains unravelled. For this the church may explain

that Ananias was given power and sent by Jesus to restore his sight. But this appears to be a lame explanation. Paul sees in his vision Ananias coming to him and putting his hand on him that he might receive his sight even before he was sent by Jesus. Therefore it may be taken for granted that Ananias became all powerful to restore his sight even before he was sent by Jesus (Acts 9:10-12). Thus the mystery still sustains-

#### **Paul was chosen of God :**

*And he said, the God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth.* *-Acts 22:14*

*For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard - (15)*

*And now why tarriest thou ? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. (16)*

All the above verses constitute the passage under Ref :

**Acts 22:12-16**

In this passage we find an important role played by one Ananias. So let us find out who this Ananias had been.

.... a devout man according to the law -- meaning a very virtuous man who was perfectly following the law. He might have been the follower of Jesus. It is conceivable from his order to Paul saying --

*"... arise and be baptized calling on the name of the Lord".* So he was a Nazarene. Now it surprises one to know that how he had a good report of all the Jews. If he were really a Jew he could not have been a devout person without believing Jesus. If he believed Jesus he could not have remained disguising himself as a Jew so as to have a good report of them. Whoever might be the real person, he appeared as a devout person according to the law having a good report of all the Jews. And he directed Paul saying as ---

*The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will and see that Just One and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth.* *-Acts 22:14*

Thus by Ananias, Paul was promoted to the rank of an additional apostle to know the will of God through the mouth of Jesus. This clearly speaks that Jesus appeared to him every often and dictated the will of God. And accordingly Paul acted. **This discloses the hidden fact that what all Paul preached was quite a new doctrinal religion other than what already had been taught by Jesus while he was yet living.**

In this regard let us recall that what Jesus says in his last prayer to God.

*I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. -John 17:4*

This speaks that Jesus had already accomplished his entrusted work of teaching. This further makes clear that there remained nothing to be accomplished later by appearing again and again after his departure. And he entrusted the responsibility of teaching what all he had taught to his apostles (Matthew 28:20) and accordingly the people had been taught by them. In the situation such as this, if Jesus appeared very often to Paul to dictate the will of God, it unequivocally proves that the latter teachings thus given through Paul bear no relevance with the earlier teachings given to the apostles. Thus Paul preached irrelevant new teachings taught by one who appeared as Jesus.

#### **When Paul was at Jerusalem-Jesus appears :**

*And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance ;*

*And saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. -Acts 22:17,18*

In this verse we find Jesus to have advised Paul that he should immediately leave Jerusalem- *"for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me."*

From the above verse- *"For they will not receive thy testimony concerning me"* is the main clause which needs clarification.

Who were they that will not receive the testimony of Paul at Jerusalem ? were they Jews ? or Nazarenes ?

For this the church may unhesitatingly explain that "THEY" were to mean Jews. Leaving his many apostles at Jerusalem to preach among the Jews - and the results being remarkably progressive why Paul alone was advised that his testimony would not be received ? When all the apostles were preaching, many Jews were receiving their message and believing on Jesus. Leaving all the apostles and disciples and other number of followers of whom every one was an active preacher of Jesus, why Paul alone was asked to quit Jerusalem on mere plea that they(Jews) would not receive his testimony ? The most sensitive point from this is - the Jews were receiving the preachings of apostles. But Paul's preachings were not acceptable as had been apprehended by Jesus(who appeared)- why ? The simple answer for this is - that Paul had been commissioned by Jesus (who appeared) to preach all new doctrines irrelevant to that of Peter's church (Acts 22:14). Were they relevant what difference does it make whether they be preached by Peter or Paul ? so as to drive away Paul from there and retain Peter and all disciples there. This discloses that the teachings of Paul were divergent. Further he says to Paul that he would send him far to Gentiles<sup>1</sup>. What a pity ! were there no Gentiles at Jerusalem so as to send to far places ? If the Gentiles of Jerusalem do not believe how can it be expected that the Gentiles of other places would receive his testimony ?

#### **DIVERGENT : NOT RELEVANT.**

Finally Paul appealed that his case might be transferred to caesar for the final judgment.

*Then Festus, when he had conferred with the council, answered, Hast thou appealed unto caesar ? unto caesar shalt thou go. -Acts 25:12*

But before sending him there, to ascertain some material evidence, Festus the Governor arranged one more sitting(hearing) in presence of the King Agrippa (Acts 25:24-27).

some points from the deposition of Paul :

*...because I shall answer for myself this day before thee touching all the things whereof I am accused of the Jews ; -Acts 26:2*

---

1. Acts 22:21

*" All the things whereof I am accused "*

This is to mean as saying --

All doctrines professed by me(Paul) were strongly contradicted by the accusers.

For this the present church may defend by saying "all accusations as made mention under Ref . Acts 25:7-12 only, but not his doctrines. But this contention is ruled out by the affirmation of the Governor Festus before the King Agrippa --

*Against whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed :*

*But had certain questions against him of their own superstition and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive*  
-Acts 25:18,19

Thus it is made clear that there were no such accusations on Paul as relating to criminal, antinational or any suchlike but purely on doctrines of superstition. What that superstition is further explained in clear terms... *of one Jesus which was dead whom Paul affirmed to be alive*. Hence it is made crystal clear that the accusers(Nazarenes) regarded the doctrine of Jesus' resurrection as mere superstition. Does this point not prove that the apostles of Jesus(Peter's church) had never preached the resurrection of Jesus ? Thus the doctrine of cross became void.

Paul repeats the same event of Jesus' appearing, in his defence on trial before King Agrippa, Bernice and the Governor Festus.

(We read in Acts 26:12-18)

In this passage the first verse emphasises on the point of obtaining authority from the high priests to oppress and bring the people of faith on Jesus to Jerusalem to imprison them.

The established point from our arguments is that both the Jews and Nazarenes were together trying to make an end of Paul and finally when they found him in the temple, they caught him and attempted to kill. But the immediate interference of the chief captain Lysias not only saved the life of Paul but also weakened the plan of killing him, and made them stand before the chief captain as mere accusers and witnesses.

Now come to the point. The passage under discussion is the deposition of Paul in defence on trial before the king Agrippa and others. The first Point of the passage is --" *Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests.*" It was used by Paul as a device to create disharmony among the Nazarenes and the Jews of whom the former ones were accusers while the latter ones were their witnesses.

The second important point is -- Paul's repeated narration of the appearance of Jesus. **If they who tried to kill Paul were only the Jews, there appears no reason in stressing upon the 'VISION ' of Jesus before the people who do not like to hear his name even.** Then therefore it is predictable that Nazarenes, the followers of peter's church were there more in number than the Jews. Thus Paul tried to impress upon Nazarenes that he was not preaching all that which they thought to be heresy of his own will but under the strict guidance and according to the instructions given by Jesus who appeared. Thus this is an another evidence to prove that Nazarenes were more particular in planning the devices to kill him than the Jews. Of course Jews were also their associates.

Let us examine an another passage -

While Paul was yet under the custody of chief captain - Jesus appears to him and says -

*And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul : for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome. -Acts 23:11*

In this passage Jesus (who appeared) said, "*Be of good cheer Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem...*" This speaks that nobody ever had preached about Jesus as did Paul. But we know that all apostles and other disciples of Jesus were restlessly engaged in conveying the message about Jesus at Jerusalem and a great number of Jews believed on Jesus. If that be the case what is it in Jesus' (who appeared to Paul) particularly saying that- "*as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem*"- other than to mean that what was preached by Paul at Jerusalem was never preached by his apostles even? This goes to mean that there was no relevance in the teachings between the churches of Peter and Paul. Peter's church was preaching according to the teachings of Jesus (Matthew 28:19-20). Paul's church was preaching irrelevant teachings as propounded by Paul by the instigation of (one appeared as) Jesus.

And again Jesus expected from Paul that he should..." testify him in Rome also."

Does this not speak that Jesus had never been preached at Rome before this and hence he wanted that Paul should go there (Rome) and testify him (Jesus) there also as he had testified at Jerusalem?(Acts 23:11)

But what shocking point is contrary to this, Peter and other apostles had already established their churches at Rome even before Paul had stepped there. Later Paul also went there, as was his custom to preach in every Peter's church, and caused divisions and established his church there. Thus Jesus had already been preached at Rome by both the churches. These points can be made evident from the following.

#### APPARENT JESUS - APPEARS TO BE UNREAL JESUS

*Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me;*

*That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea, and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints; That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed. -Romans 15:30-32*

The above passage is taken from the letter written to Romans. Taking into consideration of the contents it can be well ascertained that it was written even before Paul went to Jerusalem, where he was caught. He beseeches his disciples at Rome to pray for his successful return to Rome from Jerusalem after convincing his doctrines to the apostles of Jesus there. This speaks clearly that he had already witnessed at Rome. He preached his doctrines about Jesus there and many people accepted them. And it was they to whom he requested to pray for him. But what curious to know is that apparent Jesus asks Paul to testify him at Rome also, as though the message about him was not given there so far, showing his ignorance (Acts 23:11). And further points reveal that there was Peter's church also existing at Rome which had been established even

before Paul entered there. And it can be taken for granted that they were not idle. They were very active in preaching Jesus as according to the instructions given by Peter's church.

Thus two churches and two gospels - first one : given to Peter while Jesus was living before his departure, and the second : given to Paul in his vision after his departure, were already came into function at Rome the points of which can be noticed from the following instructions given by Paul to his church.

We read from Romans :

*Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly ; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.-Romans 16:17-18*

Now let us have a glance on one more passage from the same letter. While sending his greetings to his disciples in the order of priority, Paul states particularly ---

*Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellowprisoners, who are of note among apostles, **who also were in Christ before me.** -Roman 16:7*

From the above passage what more serious point can be ascertained is, **that Jesus had been made acquainted at Rome even before Paul was made an apostle.** There were two persons - Andronicus and Junia who had accepted Jesus and were active preachers, even before Paul stepped there "*who also were in christ before me.*" This speaks that they were Nazarenes under the leadership of Peter. They later became Paulines after when Paul had preached there - a sure testimony that there was no relevance between the teachings of Peter and Paul. Accepting one and rejecting the other measures the depth of variance in the doctrines of each other. If there is concordance in every point, no need to change the brand, is a point of commonsense.

Not knowing (perhaps) these facts, Jesus (who appeared to Paul) persuaded Paul that he had to witness at Rome as he had witnessed at Jerusalem (Acts 23:11).

Now what more serious rather than thought provoking is - had he - the one who appeared to Paul as Jesus, been real Jesus could he ever have committed such a blunder?<sup>1</sup>

And moreover - Paul should have atleast reminded him that he had established his church already at Rome. But he became a silent and obedient follower of the (apparent) Jesus. Thus both the master and the (additional) apostle committed blunder inexcusable. This further discloses that **Paul became an instrument in the hands of one apparent Jesus.**

We have seen in many places from the statements of Paul that Jesus to have appeared before him. So let us see whether he was Jesus or one that appeared like Jesus.

Keeping in view of the following exhortation of Jesus to his disciples-one can conclude that the departure of Jesus from the world was inevitable. Further it rules out the necessity of his presence in the world more often as recorded in the book of Acts and epistles of Paul. This makes clear that after his departure his coming into the world to guide was no longer needed.

1. Nevertheless I tell you the truth : (while promising of the comforter)
  - a) It is expedient for you that I go away -
  - b) for if I go not away, the comforter will not come to you.
  - c) but if I depart I will send him unto you. (John 16:7)
2. Of righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no more (John 16:10)
3. For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always (John 12:8).
4. ... I leave the world, and go to the Father (John 16:28)
5. And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come unto thee (God) (John 17:11).

---

1. To this objection church forwards some lapses of Jesus that generally go with every human being; and contend that this blunder of Jesus is also of that category. We do admit this explanation provided the event had been of the time before to his departure. Human as he was it was but natural. But here the case under discussion is about the resurrected one who is believed to be of divine nature. And hence his aptitudes must be free from human weakness.

All the foregoing points evidently speak that the coming of Jesus into the world again and again after his departure for the guiding purpose was no longer needed as the disciples had been entrusted with the responsibility of guiding the people (Matthew 28:19-20) until as the comforter would come. This makes clear that there remains no job in pending for Jesus to discharge appearing into the world.

Read what he says in this regard in clear terms...

In his prayer to God, Jesus reiterates -

*" ... I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. "*  
- John 17:4

Thus it is made clear that Jesus had left nothing in pending to be performed later so as to make himself manifest again and again in this world. Contrary to these facts Paul proclaimed that Jesus had appeared and made him an apostle. This leads to doubt whether he that appeared to Paul was the real person of Jesus or some supernatural power<sup>1</sup> in whose hands Paul became an instrument in establishing a rival church.

From the foregoing arguments it is made known that (apparent) Jesus had committed a grave blunder by expressing before Paul that he had to testify at Rome also - as if that nobody had ever testified at Rome not knowing the fact that already both the churches (one Peter's and the other Paul's) were restlessly testifying there and many people were accepting their teachings.

- > Now the question is, if he that appeared before Paul, according to his proclamation were Jesus by himself, could he ever had committed such a blunder?
- > And the second thing is, if he were real Jesus, how he could have come into the world even before to his appointed time (ie) the second coming on the day of Resurrection<sup>2</sup>?
- > If Jesus were in the habit of directing and guiding the people by appearing either in vision or direct in person - why did not he appear to his disciples?
- > Had he been the real Jesus- could ever he had neglected his disciples?

---

1. A person believed to have possessed some extraordinary human abilities and nature but subject to err and end, and not beyond fallibility. -2. John 5:28-30

- > And why was he running after Paul leaving all his apostles?
- > Were they really not competent enough to carry on the mission of Jesus?
- > Were they really incompetent, how could they had won the hearts of so many people who became believers on Jesus?

The answers in all probability are no more than ---

(1)whom Paul thought to be Jesus seems to be not real Jesus but some supernatural person<sup>1</sup> who appeared in the from of Jesus.  
(DECE PTION) (or)

(2) Paul might have been deluded in regarding some one as Jesus.  
(HALLUCINATION) (or)

(3) Paul might have wantonly plaited the false stories in the name of Jesus and claimed to have been commissioned with the responsibility of an apostle.(FRAUD)

#### PAUL WAS NOT MADE APOSTLE -APOSTLESHIPRESTRICTED TO TWELVE ONLY

*And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain and shewed me that great city the holy Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God.*

*Having the glory of God ; and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a Jasper stone, clear as crystal ;*

*And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel ;*

*On the east three gates ; on the north three gates; on the south three gates ; and on the west three gates.*

*And the wall of the city had twelve foundations and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the lamb. -Revelation 21:10-14*

---

1. A person believed to have possessed some extraordinary human abilities and nature but subject to err and end, and not beyond fallibility.

From the above passage one can find John to have seen the Holy city Jerusalem descending from the heavens. It had twelve gates for twelve tribes of Israelites and twelve foundations in which the names of twelve apostles of the Lamb had been found written.

Does this not prove that the apostleship was restricted to only twelve of his apostles ? Why not Paul's name was too added atleast in any of the corners of the foundations ? Then does it not lead to conclude that the claim of Paul that he was made an apostle was quite wrong ?

We cannot blame Paul as sole responsible for the heretic preachings contradicting the teachings of the twelve apostles. But what the hidden ( not hidden but conspicuous) secret(not secret but open fact)is he had been tempted to become an instrument in the hands of some supernatural power<sup>1</sup>. What all Paul had taught was not his innate thought but was externally influenced by the supernatural power<sup>1</sup> which manifested before him as Jesus - Light - A devout person Ananias- Holy Ghost<sup>2</sup> and Angel<sup>3</sup>.. and as a man of Macedonia who besought him to preach at Mecedonia<sup>4</sup>...and (mis)guided him.

Having paul appealed to be judged at Caesar he was sent to Rome. But having not received any letter from Judea concerning his crime, Paul was set at liberty(perhaps). And he lived in his own (rented) house for two years preaching his doctrines.

#### TheProphecyofJesusful filled

*Verily, verily I say unto thee when thou wast young thou girdest thyself and walkedest whither thou wouldest ; but when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. -John 21:18*

This is to mean as saying in brief, that Peter being the head of Jesus' mission, would lead the church in accordance to the teachings of Jesus in his early period (... when thou wast young, thou girdest thyself and walkdest whither thou wouldest ...).

But later on, in his old age his mission would be supplanted to the extent that it would appear almost like a new religion. The successive doctrines would have no relevance to his original mission (... when thou shalt be old, thou stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not).

---

1. A person believed to have possessed some extraordinary human abilities and nature but subject to err and end, and not beyond fallibility. 2. Acts 16:6-7

3. Acts 23:9, Acts 27:23-25

4. Acts 16:9-10

## INTRODUCTION

*Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. -John 20:23*

*And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Isreal. -Matthew 19:28*

The above are the assurances given by Jesus to his apostles. In this regard people generally get some doubts such as -

can anybody forgive sins?  
Is anybody competent to judge?

To be frank, except God none can forgive sins, and judgment on final day is exclusively reserved by Himself. If this be the fact, how are the apostles stated to have been given these powers? For this, one should note, that it is only metaphoric description of the apostles which show their high morality and high standard of dedicated faith above all the followers of Jesus. We have quoted these verses in the same view to disqualify other persons' claim for apostleship and their intervention in involving themselves to organise the church affairs.

*And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not : and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. -Luke 22:31-32*

From the above passage one can notice that Jesus had prayed for Peter that he might be protected from the Satanic influence. He was made the chief apostle of the church built on him by Jesus the point of which is known to all. Then it must be taken for granted that Peter was the most competent one to lead the church of Jesus after him. Then therefore as long as the followers of Jesus remained in the guidance of Peter, there was no fear for them of getting themselves put into the Satanic path.

The above view is attested by the following verse.

*And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. -Matthew 16:19*

In a nutshell the above verse means Jesus as saying that one who follows according as the instructions given by Peter, there is no fear of going astray but attains the supreme bliss in the kingdom of heaven. And those that work contrariwise go to hell a place of eternal damnation.

Jesus was sent only as a reformer of the community- Israel. Reformation is necessary only to such people as are not correctly following the scriptural commandments.

*And Jesus answering said unto them, they that are whole need not a physician: but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. -Luke 5:31-32*

When he was sending his disciples for preaching, he ordered them not to preach among Gentiles; but preach only among the perverted Israelites. Thus we read in the following:

*These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 10:5-6*

Further he makes clear the reason in exhorting them as above.

*But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 15:24*

Further he stresses on the point of his reformatory work:

*When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. -Mark 2:17*

The foregoing points give a correct picture as to why Jesus had been sent. When a reformer is sent to any community, the majority of its

people are found involved in perversion, while some people remain in correct stream for whom reformations are not necessary. This is what Jesus meant by saying- “ ***They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick.***”

Thus it is made clear that Jesus was sent only to the Israelites that too for them only who had been perverted. ***If this be the case with Jesus’ mission the claim of Paul that Jesus made him an apostle for Gentiles looks fraudulent rather than meaningless*** (Acts 22:21)<sup>1</sup>

Just to counter our point of argument and to defend the fraudulent statement of Paul basing on which he founded his church, the present Christians being the Paulines - followers of Paul, present the following verses from the gospels and maintain that Jesus was sent for the entire mankind and hence he asked his disciples at the time of his departure to preach the gospel to every creature.

A. *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Ghost.*  
-Matthew 28:19

B. *And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.* -Mark 16:15

C. *And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.*  
-Luke 24:47

From the above three references it can be noticed that Jesus had asked his disciples to preach the gospel in all nations and in all the world. All nations can be taken to mean as all world which includes Gentiles also along with Israelites. But from the earlier points it is made clear that he was sent as a reformer to the Israelites only. Hence he asked his disciples to preach among Israelites only and exhorted them not to preach among Gentiles. Thus the above two sets of references appear to be contradictory at the first instance. As a matter of fact these are not contradictory but conciliatory with our arguments. All these points can be

1. (a) And he said unto me Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles (Acts 22:21). (b). ...the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles)-Galatians 2:7-8

made clear if we take into consideration of the following statement of Jesus.

*And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.* -John 10:16

The above statement of Jesus clearly says that he had to preach the other sheep also which were not of that fold. This explains to mean as that the Jews (Israelites) had been scattered all over the other nations of the world. But the church takes the meaning of ‘other sheep’ as Gentiles. But it is not correct. This point can be proved from the following Joint accusation of Nazarenes and of Jews against Paul in the court of the Governor Felix.

*For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world and a ring leader of the sect of Nazarenes.* -Acts 24:5

The point that we need from the above reference is that it admits unequivocally that the Jews had been scattered in all nations of the world (***the Jews throughout the world***) and to them only Jesus had to preach (John 10:16). And therefore he commanded his apostles also to preach-

*Go ye and teach all nations (Matthew 28:19)...*

*Go ye into all the world and preach... (Mark 16:15)*

Thus the whole world to whom they (apostles) had to preach were only Jews who were scattered throughout the world but not the Gentiles as is the contention of the church, which it advances to defend Paul's claim. However what we would like to pinpoint is that even if we agree with the contention of the church, and the claim of Paul that he was made and appointed as an additional apostle for Gentiles is accepted-our further arguments which shall proceed in the book, rebut the claim as mere baseless and meaningless.

Many scholars have written about the two factions between whom there had been a ceaseless battle until as one was supplanted by the other. Those arguments proceed basing on historical evidence. But what

one can notice a speciality from our work is - we have discussed and brought forth the facts basing on the Gospels, the book of Acts, and Epistles of Paul- the act of which according to us, seems to be more authentic.

Until after the completion of my work, I did not consult the church history nor any other author's work. At the time of my research work on the Bible, I noticed from the Epistles of Paul, some traces of disharmony which show that there had been some dispute during his lifetime with some others. And I also noticed a great number of discrepancies between the statements of Paul in his epistles and of Jesus himself in the Gospels.

Keeping in view of these points a doubt crept into my mind as to which of the two statements is correct- whether of Jesus or of Paul. As a matter of fact no true believer can ever entertain least doubt in the sayings of prophets. yet, I made a deep research study of the Gospels and Epistles of Paul with an unbiased state of mind. As a result, what all observations came into my mind, I am pleased to put before the readers so that they may decide whether it is my whimsical product or a bunch of facts and truths irrefutable.

**How were the two factions formed?**

**How was the rival church established?**

**What were the doctrines?**

**Who were its founder members?**

**And who was its chief founder?**

**What became of Peter's church?**

**How was it supplanted?**

This book revolves on the points that how the real christianity<sup>1</sup> has been replaced by the prevalent so called christianity<sup>2</sup>. In fact there is no resemblance between the original one preached by Jesus and the one being followed these days.

---

1. Christianity here means the real teachings of Jesus followed and preached by his early followers who were known as Nazarenes. 2. Pauline Christianity founded by Paul.

Every race has its own Religious ideologies which are followed reverentially by its followers. It may be questioned that what prompted me to write such a book, being a Muslim, as this on christianity- and hence I cannot escape from my moral responsibility to answer my christian brethren.

The Qur'an- as a Muslim which I follow, enjoins upon its followers that they should believe all prophets who appeared former to Jesus and to Jesus himself as well and his disciples (HAWAARIYYUN). Not only should we believe them but also honour them with due respect.

*O ye who believe! be helpers of Allah, as said Jesus, son of Mary, to his disciples, "who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?" The disciples said, "we are helpers of Allah". -Qur'an 61:14*

From the above verse it is evident that Allah ordained the Muslims to respond to the call of prophet Mohammed; just as the disciples of Jesus responded to the call of Jesus to be his helpers in the cause of Allah. This speaks that the Muslims should take the disciples of Jesus as the ideal ones in the cause of Allah. This point is a sign that shows the intense attachment I, as a Muslim, have with Jesus.

Jesus was born in the community of Jews who have many prophecies about his advent in their scriptures. Among them he did a number of miracles such as healing the blind, leprosy, palsy and even quickening of the dead- yet the learned among them did not believe on him. And moreover they regarded him as an illegitimate son of Mary (May God forbid)<sup>1</sup>.

But the Muslim community all over the world believes him as a holy one born to virgin Mary, a chaste woman whose status is above all women of the world<sup>2</sup>. And it also believes the miracles worked by him to have been done by the command of Allah. And it also believes that those who follow according to the (real) teachings of Jesus would attain eternal life. Not only this but the Muslim community on the whole takes as its responsibility to safeguard the (real) teachings of Jesus and his pure personality from any kind of calumnious charges against him. And one who leads one's own life according as above only can be termed as a muslim, but one who acts against to these beliefs cannot be a Muslim. And this is

---

1. Qur'an 19:27 and 4:156

2. Qur'an 3:42

another point that shows the intense attachment I, as a Muslim, have with Jesus. This attachment and responsibility what I feel incumbent on me awoke me to write this book.

As according to my personal research, all religions have been perverted. Yet there is a significant difference between christianity and other religions- that is, religions such as Hinduism and Islam (Hindus and Muslims) are partially differed and deformed from the teachings of their prophets- while christianity has completely ignored the teachings of Jesus and following what has not been expounded by him. And this is why it has been fallen to the bottom of religious deformity where reformation became incredibly necessary.

In the situation such as this the responsibility what has been entrusted to me, as a Muslim is, that I should strive to bring to the notice of christians the real teachings of Jesus which have been supplanted by wrong dogmas. If I fail to discharge this duty it is evident that I cannot be one among those that love Jesus. For one that does not love Jesus for him there is no eternal life. A muslim should honour all prophets alike whth no discrimination.

*If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love: even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love*  
-John 15:10

According to the above verse whoever claims that one is loving Jesus it becomes incumbent on one's own part that one should follow the commandments of God given through Jesus. Contrary to this- following the fables invented by unconcerned people and rejoicing in delusory love towards Jesus won't do. Paul has detached the christianity from the real teachings of Jesus by his fraudulent teachings and threw it so far as one cannot see back and turn towards Jesus' real teachings. This disastrous state of Christianity has been so extensively shrowded that it became highly impossible for them to perceive this fact. For example please examine the following commandment of Paul.

*Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.*  
-1st Corinthians 11:1

The above charge of Paul is a deadly poison that appears like an ambrosia. As regards to Paul he never followed Jesus but he invented new teachings contradicting to Jesus' teachings. Had he been a real follower of Jesus he ought to have said...

*Just as I am following Jesus - ye also follow **Jesus**...*

But he insisted people to be his followers.

*a. Be followers together of me -Philippians 3:17*

*b. Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me*  
-1 Corinthians 4:16

*c. Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard and seen in me do ... -Philippians 4:9*

Thus he diverted the people from the following of Jesus and made them all follow him(Paul) who himself was following and teaching all against to the teachings of Jesus. One who follows against to the teachings of Jesus and how much more one beats one's breast saying 'I am a Christian' can never be a Christian; and hence cannot inherit the eternal life. So to bring out the Christianity which has been entangled in this dangerous situation, I have ventured to write this book only with an intention to bring the hidden facts before them so that they may ponder over.

However this book remains as an authentic documentation which discloses the root cause for clefts caused in the foundation of the original Church and the person who was sole responsible for its collapse.

Yours Well- Wisher

**Ahmed Ali**

Author

## CONTENTS

<b>1. 12 Apostles - Selected.</b>	<b>1</b>
i . Peter - Chief of the Church.	
ii . Decay of Church - Jesus' prophecy: Misinterpreted	
iii . Rival Church.	
iv . Paul proclaims - Jesus appeared in vision : and made him apostle.	
v . Discrepancy in narrations	
vi . Two Gospels - Two chiefs	
<b>2. Dispute not between Jews and disciples but between Paul's and Peter's Churches</b>	<b>10</b>
i . The prevalent Church has been founded by Paul.	
ii . Was Peter really incompetent to lead the Church?	
iii . What a mystery?	
<b>3. Doctrines as propounded by Paul</b>	<b>17</b>
i . Jesus- apostle and high priest: 1st Doctrine	
ii . Jesus is 'That Christ' 2nd Doctrine	
a) John was a prophet - but not that prophet	
b) 'That Christ' - 'That Prophet'	
iii . Jesus is redeemer - 3rd Doctrine	
iv . Doctrine of Ransom - 4th Doctrine	
v . Whom should one follow... whether Jesus or Paul?	
<b>4. Jesus was put on cross : was it his wilful sacrifice? 29</b>	
i . Satan enters into the field.	
ii . Defensive measures - resorted by Jesus.	
iii . Judas kissed Jesus - not as his last tribute - but to disclose his identity	
iv . Now let us examine what Jesus had exhorted his disciples to do, in brief.	
v . Let us have a glance over false teachers	
<b>5. Doctrine of Jesus' resurrection as preached by Paul 36</b>	
i . But his attitude was contrary	
ii . Jesus disguised himself so as not to be traced and betrayed.	
iii . Self defensive measures resorted to : by Jesus.	
iv . Attempted to run away :	

v . Earnestly expresses his wish to be set free even after his betrayal.	
vi . Death of Jesus? (and his) Resurrection?	
vii . Scripture fulfilled.	
viii . Blood and water gushed forth.	
ix . Natural body: not spiritual : Rebuts resurrection.	
x . They thought him to be spirit.	
<b>6. What is resurrection?</b>	<b>46</b>
i . Some gospel records mention Jesus to have proclaimed about his resurrection-examined.	
ii . Some statements refute doctrine of Jesus' resurrection.	
iii . Attitude of People	
iv . Attitude of disciples	
v . Attitude of Jesus	
vi . First half	
vii . Now come to the second half	
viii . Empty tomb	
ix . Magic in logic	
<b>7. Law and the stand of Paul</b>	<b>58</b>
i . Definition of law	
ii . Circumcision - comes under law - category 'A'	
iii . Circumcision	
iv . Attitude of Paul towards circumcision	
v . Paul defines the circumcision	
vi . A good advice by Paul?	
vii . Contrast between God and Paul	
viii . What Jesus says about law?	
ix . The stand of Paul on law	
x . Why all this ambiguity? He explains the reason	
<b>8. Paul - Ringleader of sect of Nazarenes</b>	<b>74</b>
i . Paul preached resurrection of Jesus - Apostles opposed	

<b>9. Jesus - son or incarnate of God? Inconsistency or fallacy?</b>	<b>77</b>
i . God calls angels as His sons	
ii . God is Father to all people	
iii . The doctrine of incarnation : by Paul	
<b>10. Brick bating of derogatory wording</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>11. Letters of Peter - forged</b>	<b>89</b>
i . No emicable terms between Peter and Paul	
<b>12. Logic rules out resurrection of Jesus</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>13. Apostles rejected Pauline doctrines</b>	<b>95</b>
i . Paul preached cross - Apostles were commissioned to Baptize: Thus discrimination between Peter and Paul is clear.	
ii . Paul preached cross - Apostles contradicted	
iii . Christ is in me and in you too if you are not reprobrates- A trick of Paul to make silence people who Questioned him.	
iv . A parable	
v . Paul says - 'we are not reprobates'	
vi . Repulsive attack - to the teachings of Paul	
<b>14. Contentions and divisions were doctrinal based among followers of Jesus - one group by the side of apostles while the other of Paul</b>	<b>106</b>
i . Following passages show - Paul wanted to avoid other group	
ii . Consecutive passages show that Paul preached among group of Peter - some attracted to his teachings- But later quit him and joined again Peter's group.	
iii . Real persons of the rival party of Paul	

iv . Rivals were not Jews - but Peter's church	
v . No concordance in the teachings of Apostles and of Paul.	
vi . Apostles - Dogs and Evil workers?	
vii . Apostles - Satan?	
<b>15. History of Paul in a nutshell - two facets of coin provide records of irrelevant events</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>16. The apostles and the disciples of Peter's church had attempted to kill Paul at Jerusalem with the help of Jews</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>17. Jesus was not founder of Christianity - but reformer of Israelites</b>	<b>144</b>
i . Paul preached new doctrines contrary to Peter's	
<b>18. When Paul came to Jerusalem?</b>	<b>148</b>
i . No relevance between teachings of Peter and Paul. No friendly attachments - but hostility prevailed.	
ii . prosecution against Paul	
iii . Paul - founder of heretic sect	
iv . Paul's church was branded heretic - Paul confesses.	
<b>19. Was Paul really made an apostle by Jesus?</b>	<b>162</b>
i . As regards to his apostleship he writes in his epistle (letter) to Galatians.	
ii . Paul sees Jesus as Light	
iii . At Damascus : Ananias meets Paul	
<b>20. Apparent Jesus - Appears to be unreal Jesus</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>21. Paul was not made apostle- Apostleship restricted to twelve only</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>22. The prophecy of Jesus fulfilled</b>	<b>180</b>

## FORWARD

Conflicts between people of any religion is common. For example, between Shivites and Vishnuvites in Hindu religion. Between Shiya and Sunni of Islam. And so also between Catholics and Baptists of Christianity. One group calls the other as heretic for the petty reasons of difference of opinion only, while principle elements of their religions are not divergent but conciliatory in every respect.

History makes it clear that the early followers of Jesus were adherent to the Judaism. And it appears to be quite reasonable as Jesus did not preach the religion of his own such as christianity - but only reformed the Jews.

*But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 15:24*

We have an information by Maurice Bucaille :

*After Jesus' departure the "little group of Apostles" formed a "Jewish sect that remained faithful to the form of worship practised in the Temple".*

further he writes :

*For these Judeo - Christians who remained 'loyal Jews' Paul was a traitor : Judeo - Christian documents call him as an 'enemy' accuse him of 'tactical double dealing...'*

I surprised to note these remarks against Paul. He is none other than Jesus himself to the present Christianity. He has occupied the most prominent place in it. His teachings are followed with greater fervour than of Jesus himself. One cannot miss to find him as the founder of christianity. Without his teachings it could not have acquired the status of an independent religion, but could have been merged in Judaism. Such are the services he rendered to the church. Yet far heavier are the accusations against him.

Were these remarks made by the antichristian community, there could have been no concern at all over the matter. But the accusers - as

according to Maurice Bucaille...

*Paul is the most controversial figure in Christianity. He was considered to be a traitor to Jesus' thought by the latter's family and by the apostles who had stayed in Jerusalem in the circle around James. Paul created christianity at the expense of those whom Jesus had gathered around him to spread his teachings. He had not known Jesus during his lifetime and he proved the legitimacy of his mission by declaring that Jesus raised from the dead, had appeared to him on the road of Damascus. It is quite reasonable to ask what christianity might have been without Paul and one could no doubt construct all sorts of hypotheses on this subject<sup>1</sup>.*

He has correctly pointed out "one could no doubt construct all sorts of hypotheses on the subject". This is because to my poor knowledge nobody has ventured to establish the facts from the reliable source, namely scriptures.

The great task that Mr. Ahmed Ali has undertaken in this book "The Profile of Paul" is highly commendable. He has discussed elaborately that what were the doctrines propounded by Paul which became root cause for the hostility between the two groups. What devices did Paul perpetrate in bringing out his mission successful? Who were they that tried to kill Paul? Paul claimed that Jesus appeared to him very often- was he the real Jesus or one that appeared in the form of Jesus? - is the question raised by the author of this book, invites serious attention of the church. Discussions made in it revolve around the points necessary in bringing out the evidence from the scriptures. Conclusion basically founded on the point that all doctrines current in the present church are not the teachings of Jesus, but of one that appeared like Jesus. I have noticed the arguments made in this book to be of immense value and free from author's hypothetical or prejudiced tendency but purely an outcome of 'discovery' what I prefer to call.

I appreciate the work that Mr. Ahmed Ali has executed in this book and congratulate him for his endeavour. I wish that many more such books from his pen, as may serve as an information for the interested people who seek after truth.

Samalkot  
20 - 07 - 2007

Glenn Periera

# THE PROFILE OF PAUL

Truth is unveiled

... I AM THE WAY, THE TRUTH AND THE LIFE...  
-JOHN 14:6

Pause a while - make sure whether you are walking just on  
the way- the path of Jesus which leads you to the life ...  
the eternal life.

Let this book

THE PROFILE OF PAUL

be a discrimination

**Ahmed Ali**

Author

Title of the book : The Profile of Paul

Authored by : Ahmed Ali

Copy rights : Reserved

For all judicial disputes- Subject to Kakinada Jurisdiction only

First Edition : 1000 Copies August 2008

Price : Rs120/-

Published by : Ahmed Ali  
D.No: 2-367 Village Chidiga  
Kakinada Rural 533006  
District East Godavari  
A.P (INDIA)

Mobile : 9490163604 9848516362

Graphics : Samba Siva  
C/o. The True Message Institute  
Kakinada

Printed at :